arXiv:math/0408164v1 [math.RT] 12 Aug 2004

On extensions and branching rules for modules close to completely splittable

Vladimir Shchigolev

vkshch@vens.ru

Abstract

We describe the modules $D^\lambda{\downarrow_{\Sigma_{n-1}}}$ and $D^\lambda{\uparrow^{\Sigma_{n+1}}}$ for certain simple $K\Sigma_n$-modules (completely splittable and some close to) D^λ, where K is a field of characteristic $p>0$ and Σ_n is the symmetric group of degree n. This result is based on an upper bound of the dimensions of the Ext^1-spaces between some simple modules.

1 Introduction

Fix a field K of characteristic $p>0$. We denote by Σ_n the symmetric group of degree n. We shall assume the natural inclusion $\Sigma_{n-1}\subset\Sigma_n$. Calculation of the modules $D^\lambda{\downarrow_{\Sigma_{n-1}}}$ (if $n>0$) and $D^\lambda{\uparrow^{\Sigma_{n+1}}}$, where D^λ is the simple $K\Sigma_n$-module corresponding to a p-regular partition λ of n, is of great importance for the representation theory of the symmetric group. We have the following decomposition into blocks of $K\Sigma_{n-1}$ and $K\Sigma_{n+1}$ (see [CR, (55.2)] and [KSh1, §1]):

$$D^\lambda{\downarrow_{\Sigma_{n-1}}}=\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}_p}\operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\lambda,\qquad D^\lambda{\uparrow^{\Sigma_{n+1}}}=\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}_p}\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda.$$

A lot of information about $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\lambda$ and $\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda$ is contained in [K4] and [BK2]. For example, the socles of these modules are known. It is also known when a module arbitrarily chosen from these is simple. On the other hand, not all composition multiplicities of nonsimple modules $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\lambda$ and $\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda$ are known in the general case.

However, all the above mentioned multiplicities can be explicitly found for some nonsimple block components. For example, the main result of [S2] allows us to prove in the present paper Theorems 9.4 and 9.5. Together with the known Proposition 9.1, they yield all composition multiplicities of

- $D^\lambda{\uparrow^{\Sigma_{n+1}}}$, where D^λ is a completely splittable $K\Sigma_n$-module (see [K3, Definition 0.1]);
- $D^{\lambda^B}{\downarrow_{\Sigma_n}}$, where D^λ is a completely splittable $K\Sigma_n$-module distinct from $D^{(1^{p-1})}$ and B is the bottom λ-addable node.

Theorem 6 from [S2] prompts for what other modules one may hope to prove similar results. A partition λ is called *big* (for fixed p), if D^λ is completely splittable, λ has more than one nonzero parts and at least one rim p-hook. In that case, we denote by $\tilde\lambda$ the partition obtained from λ by moving all the nodes from the last row of the highest rim p-hook of λ to the first row. Big modules exist only for $p>2$. In the present paper, we prove an upper bound (Theorem 8.2) of the dimensions of $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^{\tilde\lambda},D^\mu)$, where $\tilde\lambda$ does not strictly dominate μ, similar to the bound of [S2, Theorem 6]. There are examples showing that this bound is not exact. A separate paper is planed to prove the exact formula. However, the bound we have obtained is enough to

- prove the exact formula (Proposition 9.1 and Theorem 9.6) for composition multiplicities of $D^{\tilde{\lambda}}{\uparrow}^{\Sigma_{n+1}}$, where λ is a big partition of n such that $h(\lambda) \geqslant \frac{p+3}{2}$, $\lambda_1 + h(\lambda) \neq 0 \pmod{p}$ and $h_{2,1}(\lambda) \neq p-1$;
- put forward conjectures on the composition multiplicities of some $\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda$ and $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\lambda$ (Conjectures 9.7–9.9) confirmed by calculations within the known decomposition matrices.

In [BK2], the composition multiplicities of D^μ in $\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda$ and $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\lambda$ are calculated for μ one node more or respectively less than λ. Applying the Mullineux map m, one can calculate the same composition multiplicities when $m(\mu)$ is one node more or respectively less than $m(\lambda)$. However, to prove Conjectures 9.7–9.9, one must show that the required multiplicities equal 1 for some partitions μ having neither of the two mentioned forms. We conjecture that this can be done by the methods of [K4].

The paper is organized as follows. In §2, we introduce the main objects used in the text. The technique of the present paper differs from that of [S2] mainly in using abaci. The theory of abaci is presented in [JaKe]. We prove some inequalities in §3. In particular, the most useful inequalities of [S2, §3] are reproved by the methods standard for homological algebra. In §4, an inductive method of obtaining an upper bound of the dimensions of $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu)$ is described. With its help, we reprove the main result of [S2] but in a much simpler and more visual way due to using abaci. A slight, though necessary, modification of this method is used to prove Theorem 8.2. For a more precise bound in this theorem, an auxiliary upper bound obtained in §7 is needed. To sharpen this auxiliary bound, we use multiplication by the sign representation and the Mullineux map connected with it. The corresponding calculations are given in §6. Finally in §9, we prove the above mentioned results on the composition multiplicities of the induced and restricted modules.

2 Notation and definitions

2.1 Generalities. Throughout the paper, we fix a field K of positive characteristic p. All rings and modules are assumed finite dimensional over K. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\bar{n}$ denote $n + p\mathbb{Z}$, which is an element of $\mathbb{Z}_p = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. For a pair $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $m > 0$, let $\operatorname{quo}(n,m)$ and $\operatorname{rem}(n,m)$ denote the integers such that $n = \operatorname{quo}(n,m)m + \operatorname{rem}(n,m)$ and $0 \leqslant \operatorname{rem}(n,m) < m$. For integers r and s, the following notation will be used:

$$[r,s] = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : r \leqslant i \leqslant s\}, \quad (r,s] = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : r < i \leqslant s\},$$

$$[r,s) = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : r \leqslant i < s\}, \quad (r,s) = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : r < i < s\}.$$

For an arbitrary assertion ρ, let $[\rho]$ denote 1 if this assertion holds and denote 0 otherwise. For any set of integers S, we define its characteristic function by $\bar{S}(n) = [n \in S]$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We define an ordered set $\mathbb{Z}' = \mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}$, where $+\infty > n$ holds for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. For any module M and any simple module N, let $[M : N]$ denote the composition multiplicity of N in M.

2.2 Partitions. Given a sequence a, $|a|$ denotes its length. If a positive integer i is such that $i \leqslant |a|$ in the case where $|a| < +\infty$, then a_i stands for the i^{th} from the beginning element of a.

A *partition* of an integer n is an infinite nonincreasing sequence of nonnegative integers, whose elementwise sum equals n. To say that λ is a partition of n, the notation $\lambda \vdash n$ is used.

In practice we write only a finite initial part of a partition that is followed by zeros (not to be confused with finite sequences). For example, if λ is a partition and we write $\lambda = (5, 3, 0)$, then $\lambda_1 = 5$, $\lambda_2 = 3$ and $\lambda_i = 0$ for $i \geqslant 3$. The *height* of a partition λ is the number $h(\lambda)$ of its nonzero entries. A partition λ that does not contain p or more identical entries is called *p-regular*. Let $\sum \lambda$ denote the sum of all components of λ.

For a partition λ we define its *Young diagram* by the formula $[\lambda] = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} : 1 \leqslant i \leqslant h(\lambda), 1 \leqslant j \leqslant \lambda_i\}$. Elements of $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ are called *nodes*. For a node $A = (i, j)$, we put $r(A) = i$ and $\operatorname{res} A = \overline{j - i}$. If the diagrams of partitions λ and μ contain the same number of nodes of each p-residue, then we write $\lambda \sim \mu$. *Removable, addable, normal, good, conormal* and *cogood* nodes of a partition λ are defined in [BK2]. We also use the notations λ_A and λ^B, where A is a removable and B is an addable node of λ, for partitions with diagrams $[\lambda] \setminus \{A\}$ and $[\lambda] \cup \{B\}$ respectively. Let λ^t denote the partition, whose diagram is obtained by transposing $[\lambda]$.

For a partition λ and an integer i, we put $\sigma_i(\lambda) = \sum_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant i} \lambda_j$. A partition λ is said to dominate μ if $\sigma_i(\lambda) \geqslant \sigma_i(\mu)$ for any $i \geqslant 1$. This fact is denoted by $\lambda \trianglerighteq \mu$. The formula $\lambda \triangleright \mu$ means that $\lambda \trianglerighteq \mu$ and $\lambda \neq \mu$.

Let $h_{i,j}(\lambda)$ denote the length of the hook of λ with base (i, j). We have $h_{i,j}(\lambda) = \lambda_i + \lambda^t_j - i - j + 1$. *Rim, p-segment, p-edge, rim p-hook, p-core* of a partition λ are defined in [JaKe] and [Mu]. Let $e(\lambda)$ denote the number of nodes in the p-edge of a partition λ and $\varphi(\lambda)$ denote the partition obtained from λ by removing its p-edge.

2.3 Modules. To each partition λ of n there corresponds a $K\Sigma_n$-module S^λ, which is called the *Specht module* (see, for example, [Ja, Definition 4.3]). We put $D^\lambda = S^\lambda / \operatorname{rad} S^\lambda$. The map $\lambda \mapsto D^\lambda$ defines a one-to-one correspondence between p-regular partitions of n and simple $K\Sigma_n$-modules.

For $n \geqslant 0$, we put $\varepsilon_n = ((k+1)^d, k^{p-1-d})$, where $n = k(p-1) + d$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \leqslant d < p - 1$. The following proposition plays an important role in the current paper.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $p > 2$ and λ, μ be partitions of n such that $h(\lambda) < p$, μ is p-regular and $\lambda \not\triangleright \mu$. Then we have*

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, D^\mu) \cong \begin{cases} K & \text{if } \lambda = \mu = \varepsilon_n \text{ and } n \geqslant p; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof is virtually the same as that of Theorem 2.9 from [KSh1]. One must only show that $\mu = \varepsilon_n$ or $\mu = \kappa_n$ (after the assumptions $\lambda_A = \varepsilon_{n-1}$ and $\gamma = \varepsilon_{n-1}$ are made) without using Lemma 1.6.

Indeed, $\mu_C \trianglelefteq \gamma = \varepsilon_{n-1} = \lambda_A$ and $\mu_C \not\triangleleft \lambda_A$, imply $\mu_C = \varepsilon_{n-1}$. This means $\mu = \kappa_n$ or $\mu = \varepsilon_n$ or $\mu = \varepsilon^D_{n-1}$, where $D = (p, 1)$. However, the last case is impossible, since $\varepsilon^D_{n-1} \triangleleft \varepsilon_n, \kappa_n$ and $\lambda = \varepsilon_n$ or $\lambda = \kappa_n$. □

The following proposition is proved similarly to [KSh1, Theorem 2.10] but using Proposition 2.1 instead of [KSh1, Theorem 2.9].

Proposition 2.2. *Let $p > 2$ and λ, μ be partitions of n such that $h(\lambda) < p$, μ is p-regular and $\lambda \not\triangleright \mu$. Then* $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} S^\lambda, D^\mu)$.

Finally let us note the following proposition, which follows directly from [JaKe] and [KSh1, Theorem 2.10].

Proposition 2.3. *If* $\lambda \not\sim \mu$ *or if* $p > 2$, $\lambda = \mu$ *and* $h(\lambda) < p$, *then* $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu) = 0$.

The modules $\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha M$ and $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha M$, where M is a $K\Sigma_n$-module, are defined, for example in §1 of [KSh1].

2.4 Abaci. We shall slightly modify the classical notion of abacus introduced in [JaKe] to make it more symmetrical and convenient to work both with removing and adding nodes. Everything what follows can be proved by the methods of [JaKe] and [FK].

An *abacus* is any map $\Lambda : \mathbb{Z} \to \{0,1\}$ for which there exists a number N such that $\Lambda(n) = 1$ for $n \leqslant -N$ and $\Lambda(n) = 0$ for $n \geqslant N$. The *shift* of an abacus Λ is the limit $\operatorname{shift}(\Lambda) = \lim\limits_{x\to-\infty} x + \sum_{n\geqslant x} \Lambda(n)$ over integer x. Every abacus Λ defines an injective map $\operatorname{node}_\Lambda : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$\operatorname{node}_\Lambda(a) = \Big(1 + \sum_{n>a} \Lambda(n), \sum_{n\leqslant a}(1 - \Lambda(n))\Big).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} &c - r = a - \operatorname{shift}(\Lambda), \text{ where } \operatorname{node}_\Lambda(a) = (r, c);\\ &\operatorname{res}\operatorname{node}_\Lambda(a) = \bar{a} - \overline{\operatorname{shift}(\Lambda)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Indeed, take any integer x such that $\Lambda(n) = 1$ for $n < x$. Then $c - r = \sum_{x\leqslant n\leqslant a}(1 - \Lambda(n)) - 1 - \sum_{n>a} \Lambda(n) = a - x - \sum_{x\leqslant n} \Lambda(n) = a - \operatorname{shift}(\Lambda)$.

An element $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\Lambda(a) = 1$ is called a *bead* of Λ, and an element $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\Lambda(b) = 0$ is called a *space* of Λ.

A bead a of an abacus Λ is called

- *proper* if there is a space b of Λ, strictly less than a;
- *initial* if $\Lambda(a - 1) = 0$;
- *normal* if it is initial and $\sum_{0<k\leqslant s}(\Lambda(a + pk) - \Lambda(a - 1 + pk)) \geqslant 0$ for any $s > 0$;
- *good* if it is the smallest normal bead of a given p-residue;
- *movable up* if $\Lambda(a - p) = 0$.

A space b of an abacus Λ is called

- *initial* if $\Lambda(b - 1) = 1$;
- *conormal* if it is initial and $\sum_{0<k\leqslant s}(\Lambda(b - 1 - pk) - \Lambda(b - pk)) \geqslant 0$ for any $s > 0$;
- *cogood* if it is the greatest conormal space of a given p-residue.

If an abacus contains at least one proper bead, then it is called *proper*. Otherwise it is called *improper*.

The first formula of (2.1) shows what partition should be assigned to an abacus Λ. Let a_1, a_2, $\ldots$ be all the beads of Λ written in descending order. We have $\operatorname{node}_\Lambda(a_i) = (i, \lambda_i)$ for some numbers λ_i. We define the partition $P(\Lambda) = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots)$. Λ is said to be an *abacus* of $P(\Lambda)$. Let h denote the number of proper beads in Λ. Clearly $P(\Lambda)$ has height h. In this connection the number of proper beads of an abacus is called its *height.* We have

$h_{i,1}(P(\Lambda)) = a_i - b$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant h$, where b is the smallest space of Λ, which is obviously equal to $\mathrm{shift}(\Lambda) - h$.

Let Λ be an arbitrary abacus and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we put $(m+\Lambda)(n) = \Lambda(n+m)$. An elementary verification shows that

$$P(m+\Lambda) = P(\Lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{shift}(m+\Lambda) = -m + \mathrm{shift}(\Lambda). \tag{2.2}$$

Note that for every partition λ there is exactly one abacus Λ of a given shift such that $\lambda = P(\Lambda)$. This fact and (2.2) imply that if $P(\Lambda) = P(\mathrm{M})$ then $\mathrm{shift}(\Lambda)+\Lambda = \mathrm{shift}(\mathrm{M})+\mathrm{M}$.

Proposition 2.4. node_Λ *bijectively maps:*

1. *the set of Λ-initial beads to the set of $P(\Lambda)$-removable nodes;*
2. *the set of Λ-normal beads to the set of $P(\Lambda)$-normal nodes;*
3. *the set of Λ-good beads to the set of $P(\Lambda)$-good nodes;*
4. *the set of Λ-initial spaces to the set of $P(\Lambda)$-addable nodes;*
5. *the set of Λ-conormal spaces to the set of $P(\Lambda)$-conormal nodes;*
6. *the set of Λ-cogood spaces to the set of $P(\Lambda)$-cogood nodes.*

Let c be an initial bead or an initial space of an abacus Λ. Denote by Λ_c in the former case and by Λ^c in the latter case the abacus, whose value at n is $1 - \Lambda(n)$ if $n = c$ or $n = c - 1$ and is $\Lambda(n)$ if $n \neq c$ and $n \neq c - 1$. The operations of removing and adding nodes are connected with the transformations of abaci just described by

$$P(\Lambda_c) = P(\Lambda)_{\mathrm{node}_\Lambda(c)} \text{ if } c \text{ is an initial bead,}$$

$$P(\Lambda^c) = P(\Lambda)^{\mathrm{node}_\Lambda(c)} \text{ if } c \text{ is an initial space.}$$

One of the main causes to use abaci is that they help easily watch the removal of rim p-hooks and p-edges. Let a be a movable up bead of Λ. Denote by $\mathrm{hook}_\Lambda(a)$ the rim hook of $P(\Lambda)$ with base $(\sum_{n \geqslant a} \Lambda(n), \sum_{n \leqslant a-p}(1 - \Lambda(n)))$. The abacus, whose value at n is $1 - \Lambda(n)$ if $n = a$ or $n = a - p$ and is $\Lambda(n)$ if $n \neq a$ and $n \neq a - p$, is said to be obtained from Λ by *moving a one position up.*

Proposition 2.5. *The map* hook_Λ *is a bijection from the set of all movable up beads of Λ to the set of all rim p-hooks of $P(\Lambda)$. Moreover, if $\bar{\Lambda}$ is the abacus obtained from Λ by moving the bead a one position up, then $P(\bar{\Lambda})$ is the partition obtained from $P(\Lambda)$ by removing* $\mathrm{hook}_\Lambda(a)$.

The above terminology is explained by the following way of representing abaci. Let Λ be an arbitrary abacus. Let the position (r, c) of the table T, where $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $c = 0, \ldots, p-1$, be occupied by $\cdot$ if $\Lambda(pr + c) = 0$ and by $\circ$ if $\Lambda(pr + c) = 1$. According to the definition of an abacus there are two numbers r_1 and r_2 such that row r of T is occupied solely by $\circ$ if $r < r_1$ and is occupied solely by $\cdot$ if $r > r_2$. Let us draw only rows r of T with $r_1 \leqslant r \leqslant r_2$ and indicate the number of any row.

In this connection the set $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n = i \pmod p\}$, where $0 \leqslant i \leqslant p-1$, is called the i^{th} *runner.*

Example. Let $\Lambda = \overline{(-\infty, 0] \cup \{4, 8, 9, 11, 14, 17\}}$. A representation of this abacus for $p = 7$ is

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \circ & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \circ & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \circ & \circ & \cdot & \circ & \cdot & \cdot \\ \circ & \cdot & \cdot & \circ & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array}$$

where row 0 is the highest. We have $P(\Lambda) = (11, 9, 7, 6, 6, 3)$.

Let us continue the functions φ and e defined in §2.2 to the set of all abaci so that $P(\varphi(\Lambda)) = \varphi(P(\Lambda))$ and $e(\Lambda) = e(P(\Lambda))$ for any abacus Λ.

Let Λ be an arbitrary abacus. Denote by a the greatest bead and by b the smallest space of this abacus.

We put $\varphi(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ and $e(\Lambda) = 0$ for any improper abacus Λ. In the remaining part of this subsection we assume that Λ is proper. Following [FK, Definition 1.3], we consider the set of beads $\{m_1, \ldots, m_N\}$ of Λ (in the paper just cited it is called "set of r-movable beads") that is as follows. We put $m_1 = a$. Suppose the beads $m_1, \ldots, m_i$ are already chosen. If one of the following conditions holds:

- $m_i - p$ is an improper bead;
- $m_i - p$ is a space and there are no beads less than $m_i - p$,

then we put $N = i$ and we stop here. In the opposite case, m_{i+1} is equal to the greatest bead c of Λ such that $c \leqslant m_i - p$. It can be easily seen that all the beads $m_1, \ldots, m_N$ we have built are proper.

We shall build the abacus $\varphi(\Lambda)$ as follows. If $m_N - p$ is an improper bead, then we move m_N to position b. Otherwise we move m_N to position $m_N - p$. The remaining beads $m_{N-1}, \ldots, m_1$ must be moved one position up one after another starting with m_{N-1} and ending with m_1. Denoted by $\varphi(\Lambda)$ the resulting abacus. Let

$$e(\Lambda) = \sum P(\Lambda) - \sum P(\varphi(\Lambda)).$$

2.5 Operation $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon$. In the sequel for any abacus Λ and a positive integer i, $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda(i)$ denotes the i^{th} bead of Λ counting from the greatest one and $\mathrm{b}_\Lambda(i)$, where $i \leqslant h(\Lambda)$, denotes the i^{th} proper bead of Λ counting from the smallest one. If Λ is proper then we abbreviate $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda = \mathrm{b}^\Lambda(1)$ and $\mathrm{b}_\Lambda = \mathrm{b}_\Lambda(1)$.

Let ε be a finite set of integers. Consider the following map

$$\Lambda + \sum_{i=1}^{|\varepsilon|} \left(\overline{\{\mathrm{b}^\Lambda(i) + p\varepsilon_i\}} - \overline{\{\mathrm{b}^\Lambda(i)\}} \right). \tag{2.3}$$

As we want to obtain an abacus again, we shall say that $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon$ is applicable to Λ if and only if (2.3) defines an abacus. In that case we define $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\Lambda)$ to be map (2.3). For a partition λ, we put $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\lambda) = P(\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\Lambda))$, where $\lambda = P(\Lambda)$. Clearly $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\lambda)$ is well defined.

In other words, if $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon$ is applicable to Λ, then $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\Lambda)$ is obtained from Λ by moving each bead $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda(i)$, where $1 \leqslant i \leqslant |\varepsilon|$, to position $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda(i) + p\varepsilon_i$.

Definition 2.6. *An abacus (partition) is called ε-big, if it is completely splittable of height $|\varepsilon|$ and $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon$ is applicable to it.*

We have the following evident assertion.

Lemma 2.7. *Let Λ be an ε-big abacus and $1 \leqslant i \leqslant |\varepsilon|$ such that the runner containing $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda(i) + 1$ contains no proper bead of Λ. Then $\Lambda^{\mathrm{b}^\Lambda(i)+1}$ is ε-big and $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\Lambda^{\mathrm{b}^\Lambda(i)+1}) = \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\Lambda)^{\mathrm{b}^\Lambda(i)+1+p\varepsilon_i}$.*

3 Inequalities

We state the following standard fact for future reference.

Proposition 3.1. *Let A, B, C be finite dimensional K-spaces and R be a K-algebra.*

(a) *If $A \to B \to C$ is an exact sequence, then* $\dim B \leqslant \dim A + \dim C$.

(b) *If A, B, C are R-modules and A is isomorphic to a submodule of B, then* $\dim \operatorname{Hom}_R(C, A) \leqslant \dim \operatorname{Hom}_R(C, B)$.

(c) *If A, B, C are R-modules and A is a homomorphic image of B, then* $\dim \operatorname{Hom}_R(A, C) \leqslant \dim \operatorname{Hom}_R(B, C)$.

3.1 Case of restricted height. We define

$$\varepsilon(\lambda, \mu) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } \lambda = \mu^B \text{ for a } \mu\text{-conormal node } B; \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\gamma(\mu, \lambda) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } \mu = \lambda_A \text{ for a } \lambda\text{-normal node } A; \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $p > 2$, λ and μ be p-regular partitions of $n > 0$, $h(\lambda) < p$, $\lambda \not\triangleright \mu$ and A be a μ-good node of residue α. Then we have*

$$\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu) \leqslant \dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(\operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\lambda, D^{\mu_A}) + \varepsilon(\lambda, \mu_A).$$

Proof. In view of Proposition 2.3, we can assume $\lambda \sim \mu$. Applying the functor $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha$ to the exact sequence $0 \to \operatorname{rad} S^\lambda \to S^\lambda \to D^\lambda \to 0$, we get the exact sequence $0 \to \operatorname{Res}_\alpha \operatorname{rad} S^\lambda \to \operatorname{Res}_\alpha S^\lambda \to \operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\lambda \to 0$. Applying $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(-, D^{\mu_A})$ to the last sequence, we get the exact sequence

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(\operatorname{Res}_\alpha S^\lambda, D^{\mu_A}) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(\operatorname{Res}_\alpha \operatorname{rad} S^\lambda, D^{\mu_A}) \to \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(\operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\lambda, D^{\mu_A}). \tag{3.1}$$

By Frobenius reciprocity, [BK2, Theorem E(iii)] and $\lambda \sim \mu$, we have

$$\dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(\operatorname{Res}_\alpha S^\lambda, D^{\mu_A}) = \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\mu_A}) = \varepsilon(\lambda, \mu_A).$$

By Frobenius reciprocity, the fact that D^μ is isomorphic to a submodule of $\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\mu_A}$, Proposition 3.1(b) and Proposition 2.2, we get

$$\dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(\operatorname{Res}_\alpha \operatorname{rad} S^\lambda, D^{\mu_A}) = \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} S^\lambda, \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\mu_A}) \geqslant$$
$$\dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} S^\lambda, D^\mu) = \dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu).$$

Now it remains to apply Proposition 3.1(a) to sequence (3.1). □

Dually we prove

Lemma 3.3. *Let $p > 2$, λ and μ be p-regular partitions of n, $h(\lambda) < p$, $\lambda \not\triangleright \mu$ and A be a μ-cogood node of residue α. Then we have*

$$\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu) \leqslant \dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda, D^{\mu^A}) + \gamma(\lambda, \mu^A).$$

3.2 Case of arbitrary height. In the absence of the restriction $h(\lambda) < p$, the estimation of the dimension of $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu)$ can be carried out in a different way.

Lemma 3.4. *Let λ and μ be distinct p-regular partitions of $n > 0$ and A be a λ-good node of residue α. We have*

$$\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu) \leqslant \dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(D^{\lambda_A}, \operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\mu) + \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}, D^\mu).$$

Proof. Let I be the injective hull of D^μ. Since $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, I) = 0$, we have $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, I/D^\mu)$. Let M be a $K\Sigma_n$-submodule of I such that $D^\mu \subset M$ and $M/D^\mu \cong \operatorname{soc}(I/D^\mu)$. Applying the functor $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha$ to the exact sequence $0 \to D^\mu \to M \to M/D^\mu \to 0$ and then applying $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(D^{\lambda_A}, -)$, we get the exact sequence

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(D^{\lambda_A}, \operatorname{Res}_\alpha M) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(D^{\lambda_A}, \operatorname{Res}_\alpha(M/D^\mu)) \to \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(D^{\lambda_A}, \operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\mu). \quad (3.2)$$

By Frobenius reciprocity, the fact that D^λ is a homomorphic image of $\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}$ and Proposition 3.1(c), we get

$$\dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(D^{\lambda_A}, \operatorname{Res}_\alpha(M/D^\mu)) = \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}, M/D^\mu) \geqslant$$

$$\dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, \operatorname{soc}(I/D^\mu)) = \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, I/D^\mu) = \dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu).$$

Apply $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(-, M)$ to the exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A} \to \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A} \to D^\lambda \to 0$$

and get the exact sequence

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, M) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}, M) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}, M). \quad (3.3)$$

The first term of this sequence is 0, since $\mu \neq \lambda$

Let us see what is the image of the last morphism of sequence (3.3). Take any $\varphi \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}, M)$. Since M/D^μ is semisimple, we have $\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A} \subset \operatorname{Ker}(\pi \circ \varphi)$, where $\pi : M \to M/D^\mu$ is the natural projection. Hence $\varphi(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}) \subset D^\mu$.

Therefore the last term of sequence (3.3) can be replaced by $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}, D^\mu)$. Hence by Frobenius reciprocity

$$\dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(D^{\lambda_A}, \operatorname{Res}_\alpha M) = \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}, M) \leqslant \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}, D^\mu).$$

Now it remains to apply Proposition 3.1(a) to sequence (3.2). □

Dually we prove

Lemma 3.5. *Let λ and μ be distinct p-regular partitions of n and A be a λ-cogood node of residue α. We have*

$$\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu) \leqslant \dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(D^{\lambda^A}, \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^\mu) + \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^{\lambda^A}, D^\mu).$$

Remark. It follows from [KSh1, Theorem 2.10] that Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 remain true for $\lambda = \mu$ in the case $p > 2$ and $h(\lambda) < p$.

It turns out that the parameters $\dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}, D^\mu)$ and $\dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^{\lambda^A}, D^\mu)$ arising in Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 sometimes admit upper bounds.

Lemma 3.6. *Let λ be a p-regular partition of n and M be a $K\Sigma_n$-module such that $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, \operatorname{rad} M) = 0$, $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, \operatorname{rad} M) = 0$ and $\operatorname{head}(M) \cong D^\lambda$. Then M is a $K\Sigma_n$-homomorphic image of S^λ.*

Proof. Applying $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, -)$ to the exact sequence $0 \to \operatorname{rad} M \to M \to D^\lambda \to 0$, we get the exact sequence

$$0 = \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, \operatorname{rad} M) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, M) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, D^\lambda) \to \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, \operatorname{rad} M) = 0$$

Hence $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, M) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, D^\lambda) \cong K$ and there exists a nonzero homomorphism $\varphi : S^\lambda \to M$. Since $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, \operatorname{rad} M) = 0$, we have $\operatorname{Im}\varphi \not\subset \operatorname{rad} M$ and thus $\operatorname{Im}\varphi = M$. □

Lemma 3.7. *Let λ and μ be distinct p-regular partitions of $n > 0$ such that $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, D^\mu) = 0$. Suppose that there exists a λ-good node A and a μ-good node B of residue α and that A is the unique λ-normal node of residue α and $\lambda_A \neq \mu_B$. Then $\dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}, D^\mu) \leqslant \varepsilon(\lambda, \mu_B)$.*

Proof. In view of Proposition 2.3, we can assume $\lambda \sim \mu$. We put for brevity $n = \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}, D^\mu)$. Let V be a $K\Sigma_n$-submodule of $\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}$ such that $\left(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}\right)/V \cong \bigoplus nD^\mu$. We put $M = \left(\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}\right)/V$. Applying the functor $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha$ to the exact sequence $0 \to \operatorname{rad} M \to M \to D^\lambda \to 0$ and taking into account the equivalence $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\lambda \cong D^{\lambda_A}$, which follows from the uniqueness of A as a λ-normal node of residue α, we get the exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{Res}_\alpha \operatorname{rad} M \to \operatorname{Res}_\alpha M \xrightarrow{\pi} D^{\lambda_A} \to 0. \tag{3.4}$$

By Frobenius reciprocity, we get

$$0 \neq \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}, M) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(D^{\lambda_A}, \operatorname{Res}_\alpha M).$$

Let χ be any nonzero element of the last space. We have

$$\operatorname{soc} \operatorname{Res}_\alpha \operatorname{rad} M \cong \operatorname{soc} \operatorname{Res}_\alpha \left(\bigoplus nD^\mu\right) \cong \operatorname{soc}\left(\bigoplus n \operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\mu\right) \cong \bigoplus n \operatorname{soc} \operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\mu \cong \bigoplus nD^{\mu_B}.$$

It follows from this formula and from $\lambda_A \neq \mu_B$ that $\operatorname{Im}\chi \cap \operatorname{Res}_\alpha \operatorname{rad} M = 0$. Therefore χ splits the epimorphism π of sequence (3.4) and

$$\operatorname{Res}_\alpha M \cong D^{\lambda_A} \oplus \operatorname{Res}_\alpha \operatorname{rad} M. \tag{3.5}$$

Since D^{μ_B} is a homomorphic image of $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^\mu$, the module $\bigoplus nD^{\mu_B}$ is a homomorphic image of $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha \operatorname{rad} M$, which by (3.5) is a homomorphic image of $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha M$.

In view of $\operatorname{head}(M) \cong D^\lambda$ and $\operatorname{rad} M \cong \bigoplus nD^\mu$, Lemma 3.6 is applicable to M. Therefore M is a homomorphic image of S^λ. Hence $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha M$ is a homomorphic image of $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha S^\lambda$. As a result we get that $\bigoplus nD^{\mu_B}$ is a homomorphic image of $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha S^\lambda$.

By Proposition 3.1(c), Frobenius reciprocity, [BK2, Theorem E(iii)] and $\lambda \sim \mu$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}\left(\bigoplus nD^{\mu_B}, D^{\mu_B}\right) \leqslant \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(\operatorname{Res}_\alpha S^\lambda, D^{\mu_B}) \\ &= \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\mu_B}) = \varepsilon(\lambda, \mu_B). \end{aligned}$$

□

Dually we prove

Lemma 3.8. *Let λ and μ be distinct p-regular partitions of n such that* $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(S^\lambda, D^\mu) = 0$. *Suppose that there exists a λ-cogood node A and μ-cogood node B of residue α and that A is the unique λ-conormal node of residue α and $\lambda^A \neq \mu^B$. Then* $\dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^{\lambda^A}, D^\mu) \leqslant \gamma(\lambda, \mu^B)$.

3.3 Filtrations and self-duality. For the remainder of the section, we use the notation of [BK2, § 2].

Lemma 3.9. *Fix $\lambda \in X^+(n)$ and a residue $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Let $s_1 < \cdots < s_k$ denote the set of all j such that j is conormal for λ and $res(j, \lambda_j + 1) = \alpha$. Take $\gamma \in X^+(n)$ such that*

$$[\operatorname{Tr}^\alpha L_n(\lambda) : L_n(\gamma)] > 2 \sum_{i=2}^{k} [\Delta_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_i}) : L_n(\gamma)].$$

Then $\gamma = \lambda + \varepsilon_{s_1}$.

Proof. We put $N = \operatorname{Tr}^\alpha L_n(\lambda)$. By [BK2, Theorem C], there exists a filtration $0 = N_0 \subset N_1 \subset \cdots \subset N_k = N$ such that for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant k$ the module N_i/N_{i-1} is a nonzero homomorphic image of $\Delta_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_i})$.

Suppose that $\gamma \neq \lambda + \varepsilon_{s_1}$. Then we have $[N_1 : L_n(\gamma)] = [\operatorname{rad} N_1 : L_n(\gamma)]$. Since N is contravariantly self-dual, there exists a submodule $M \subset N$ contravariantly dual to $N/\operatorname{rad} N_1$. Assumption $N_1 \subset M$ (actually even $\operatorname{rad} N_1 \subset M$) leads to a contradiction as follows:

$$[N : L_n(\gamma)] = [N/\operatorname{rad} N_1 : L_n(\gamma)] + [\operatorname{rad} N_1 : L_n(\gamma)] \leqslant 2[M : L_n(\gamma)]$$

$$= 2[N/\operatorname{rad} N_1 : L_n(\gamma)] = 2[N/N_1 : L_n(\gamma)] \leqslant 2 \sum_{i=2}^{k} [\Delta_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_i}) : L_n(\gamma)].$$

Now the second isomorphism theorem yields $0 \neq N_1 + M/M \cong N_1/N_1 \cap M$, whence $[N_1 + M/M : L_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_1})] = 1$. Recall that $[N : L_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_1})] = 1$ as follows from [BK2, Theorem B(iv)] and $[\operatorname{rad} N_1 : L_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_1})] \leqslant [\operatorname{rad} \Delta_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_1}) : L_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_1})] = 0$. Now a contradiction follows from

$$[M : L_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_1})] = [N : L_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_1})] - [\operatorname{rad} N_1 : L_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_1})] = 1,$$

$$[N_1 + M/M : L_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_1})] \leqslant [N : L_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_1})] - [M : L_n(\lambda + \varepsilon_{s_1})] = 0.$$

□

Lemma 3.10. *Fix a p-regular partition $\lambda \vdash r$ and a residue $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Let $B_1, \ldots, B_k$ be all the λ-conormal nodes of residue α counted from bottom to top. Suppose that for some p-regular $\gamma \vdash r + 1$ there holds*

$$[\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda : D^\gamma] > 2 \sum_{i=2}^{k} [S^{\lambda^{B_i}} : D^\gamma].$$

Then $\gamma = \lambda^{B_1}$.

Proof. Choose any $n > r$. Then [BK1, Theorem 4.16] yields $[\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda : D^\gamma] = [\operatorname{Tr}^\alpha L_n(\lambda^t) : L_n(\gamma^t)]$ and [G, Lemma (6.6b)] yields $[S^{\lambda^{B_i}} : D^\gamma] = [\Delta_n((\lambda^{B_i})^t) : L_n(\gamma^t)]$, where λ^t, γ^t, $(\lambda^{B_i})^t$ are considered as elements of $X^+(n)$. Now the desired result follows from Lemma 3.9. □

Remark. We conjecture that the result for $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha$ dual to Lemma 3.10 also holds and follows (applying [BK2, Theorems C′, B′(iv)]) form the lemma for Tr_α reciprocal to Lemma 3.9, [BK2, Lemma 7.4] for a suitable choice of n and [K1, Theorem 2.11(v)].

4 Completely splittable partitions

4.1 General construction. Choose a set X, whose every element has the form (λ, μ), where λ and μ are p-regular partitions such that $h(\lambda) < p$, $\lambda \not\trianglerighteq \mu$, $\lambda \sim \mu$ and there exists at most one λ-normal node of each residue.

Define the map $U : X \to \mathbb{Z}'$ inductively as follows. We put $U(\emptyset, \emptyset) = 0$. Now let (λ, μ) be a pair of nonempty partitions of X. For each μ-good node A, let $m_A(\lambda, \mu)$ equal the following number:

- $\varepsilon(\lambda, \mu_A)$ if there is no λ-good node of residue $\operatorname{res} A$;
- $U(\lambda_B, \mu_A) + \varepsilon(\lambda, \mu_A)$ if there is a λ-good node B of residue $\operatorname{res} A$ and $(\lambda_B, \mu_A) \in X$.
- $+\infty$ if there is a λ-good node B of residue $\operatorname{res} A$ and $(\lambda_B, \mu_A) \notin X$,

Define $U(\lambda, \mu) = \min\{m_A(\lambda, \mu) : A \text{ is a } \mu\text{-good node}\}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $p > 2$ and $(\lambda, \mu) \in X$. Then* $\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu) \leqslant U(\lambda, \mu)$, *where* $\lambda, \mu \vdash n$.

Proof is by induction on n applying Lemma 3.2. □

4.2 Case of completely splittable partitions.

Definition [K3, 0.1]. *An irreducible $K\Sigma_n$-module D^λ is called completely splittable if and only if the restriction $D^\lambda{\downarrow_{\Sigma^\mu}}$ to any Young subgroup $\Sigma^\mu \subset \Sigma_n$ is semisimple.*

For a partition λ, we put $\chi(\lambda) = 0$ if $\lambda = \emptyset$ and $\chi(\lambda) = \lambda_1 - \lambda_{h(\lambda)} + h(\lambda)$ otherwise. The following result yields the exact criterion for a module to be completely splittable.

Theorem [K3, 2.1]. *The module D^λ is completely splittable if and only if $\chi(\lambda) \leqslant p$.*

A partition λ and any abacus Λ of this partition in the case where D^λ is completely splittable are also called *completely splittable*.

The first formula of (2.1) shows that for any proper abacus we have

$$\chi(P(\Lambda)) = \mathrm{b}^\Lambda - \mathrm{b}_\Lambda + 1. \tag{4.1}$$

It follows from this formula that any proper abacus Λ is completely splittable if and only if $\mathrm{b}_\Lambda > \mathrm{b}^\Lambda - p$.

Definition 4.2. *A $(-1, 0^n, 1)$-big abacus (partition), where $n \geqslant 0$, is simply called big. For any big abacus (partition) of height h, we put $\tilde{\Lambda} = \mathcal{H}_{(-1,0^{h-2},1)}(\Lambda)$.*

It is easy to see that an abacus Λ is big if and only if it is proper, $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda > \mathrm{b}_\Lambda > \mathrm{b}^\Lambda - p$ and b^Λ is movable up.

Let γ be a partition and C be a γ-removable node. Then we have

$$\sigma_i(\gamma_C) = \begin{cases} \sigma_i(\gamma) & \text{if } i < r(C); \\ \sigma_i(\gamma) - 1 & \text{if } i \geqslant r(C). \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

Lemma 4.3.

(a) *If λ is a completely splittable partition, μ is any partition, A is a μ-removable node, B is a λ-good node,* $\operatorname{res} A = \operatorname{res} B$ *and $\lambda \not\trianglerighteq \mu$, then $\lambda_B \not\trianglerighteq \mu_A$.*

(b) *If ν is a partition not containing distinct removable nodes of the same residue, μ is an arbitrary partition, A is a μ-removable node, B is a ν-good node, $\operatorname{res} A = \operatorname{res} B$ and $\nu \lhd \mu$, then $\nu_B \ntrianglerighteq \mu_A$.*

Proof. We put for brevity $x = r(A)$ and $y = r(B)$.

(a) Suppose $\lambda_B \trianglerighteq \mu_A$. Since B is λ-normal, we have $\lambda_1 - \lambda_y + y < p$. It follows from (4.2) that $\sigma_i(\lambda) \geqslant \sigma_i(\mu)$ for $i < x$ and $i \geqslant y$. If $\sigma_i(\lambda) \geqslant \sigma_i(\mu)$ also holds for each i such that $x \leqslant i < y$, then we have $\lambda \trianglerighteq \mu$, contrary to the hypothesis. Therefore we assume that there exists j such that $x \leqslant j < y$, $\sigma_j(\lambda) < \sigma_j(\mu)$ and $\sigma_i(\lambda) \geqslant \sigma_i(\mu)$ for all $i < j$. Since $(\lambda_B)_1 \geqslant (\mu_A)_1$, we have $\lambda_1 \geqslant \mu_1 - 1 \geqslant \mu_x - x$. Hence

$$p > \lambda_1 - \lambda_y + y \geqslant (\mu_x - x) - (\lambda_y - y) \geqslant (\mu_j - j) - (\lambda_y - y).$$

Now prove that the right hand side of the last inequality is greater than 0. Suppose this is false. The inequalities $\sigma_j(\lambda_B) \geqslant \sigma_j(\mu_A)$, $\sigma_j(\lambda) < \sigma_j(\mu)$ and (4.2) imply $\sigma_j(\lambda) = \sigma_j(\mu) - 1$ or in a different form $\lambda_j + \sigma_{j-1}(\lambda) - \mu_j - \sigma_{j-1}(\mu) + 1 = 0$. Hence

$$\big(\sigma_{j-1}(\lambda) - \sigma_{j-1}(\mu)\big) + \big(\lambda_j - \lambda_y + 1\big) + \big(y - j\big) \leqslant 0.$$

This formula is a contradiction, as the expression in its first pair of brackets is nonnegative and the expressions in the other two are positive. Therefore, we have $p > (\mu_x - x) - (\lambda_y - y) > 0$ and $\operatorname{res} A \neq \operatorname{res} B$.

(b) Suppose $\nu_B \trianglerighteq \mu_A$. It follows from (4.2) that $\sigma_i(\nu) \geqslant \sigma_i(\mu)$ for $i < x$ and $i \geqslant y$. If $\sigma_i(\nu) \geqslant \sigma_i(\mu)$ also holds for each i such that $x \leqslant i < y$, then we have $\nu \trianglerighteq \mu$, contrary to the condition $\nu \lhd \mu$. Therefore we assume that there exists j such that $x \leqslant j < y$, $\sigma_j(\nu) < \sigma_j(\mu)$ and $\sigma_i(\nu) \geqslant \sigma_i(\mu)$ for all $i < j$. Since $\nu \lhd \mu$, we have $\sigma_i(\nu) = \sigma_i(\mu)$ for all $i < j$ and thus $\nu_i = \mu_i$ for all $0 \leqslant i < j$. Similarly to part (a), we get $\sigma_j(\nu) = \sigma_j(\mu) - 1$, whence $\nu_j = \mu_j - 1$.

If $x < j$ then A and B are distinct ν-removable nodes of the same residue, which is a contradiction. Therefore $x = j$ and A is ν-addable. By the definition of a normal node there exists a ν-removable node of residue $\operatorname{res} B$ strictly between B and A. This is again a contradiction. $\square$

Let us apply the construction described in §4.1 to the following set

$$X = \{(\lambda, \mu) : \lambda \text{ is completely splittable, } \mu \text{ is } p\text{-regular, } \lambda \ntrianglerighteq \mu,\ \lambda \sim \mu\},$$

which we fix until the end of this section. Note that $X = \emptyset$ if $p = 2$, as in that case the following conditions cannot hold simultaneously: λ is completely splittable, $\lambda \ntrianglerighteq \mu$, $\lambda \sim \mu$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $(\lambda, \mu) \in X$. Then $U(\lambda, \mu) = 0$ except the case $\mu = \tilde{\lambda}$, in which we have $U(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}) \leqslant 1$.*

Proof. Induction on $n = \sum \lambda$. For $n = 0$, by definition we have $U(\lambda, \mu) = 0$.

Now let $n > 0$. Suppose that the theorem is true for partitions of numbers less than n. Choose some abaci M and Λ of the same shift such that $\mu = P(\mathrm{M})$ and $\lambda = P(\Lambda)$. Let A be an arbitrary μ-good node. It exists because μ is nonempty and p-regular. Denote by a the bead of M corresponding to A.

First consider the case $\varepsilon(\lambda, \mu_A) = 1$. Then $\Lambda = (\mathrm{M}_a)^c$ for some conormal space c of M_a. Since $\lambda \sim \mu$ and $\lambda \ntrianglerighteq \mu$, a and c are in the same runner and moreover a is below c. We have $\mathrm{M} = (\Lambda_c)^a$. This at once implies $c = \mathrm{b}_\Lambda$, $a = \mathrm{b}_\Lambda + p$, $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda + 1 = \mathrm{b}_\Lambda + p$ (i.e. $\chi(\lambda) = p$) and $\mathrm{M} = \tilde{\Lambda}$ (i.e. $\mu = \tilde{\lambda}$). Note that in this case the only bead of Λ from the same runner as a is c, which is not normal. Therefore, there is no λ-good node of residue $\operatorname{res} A$ and $U(\lambda, \mu) \leqslant m_A(\lambda, \mu) = \varepsilon(\lambda, \mu_A) = 1$.

Now consider the case $\varepsilon(\lambda, \mu_A) = 0$ If there is no λ-good node of residue $\operatorname{res} A$, then $U(\lambda, \mu) = m_A(\lambda, \mu) = 0$. Therefore we assume that there is a λ-good node B of residue $\operatorname{res} A$. Applying Lemma 4.3(a), we get $\lambda_B \ntrianglerighteq \mu_A$, whence $(\lambda_B, \mu_A) \in X$. Thus $U(\lambda, \mu) \leqslant m_A(\lambda, \mu) = U(\lambda_B, \mu_A)$. Therefore we shall consider the case $U(\lambda_B, \mu_A) > 0$.

Let b be the bead of Λ corresponding to B. By the inductive hypothesis, we get $\mu_A = \widetilde{\lambda_B}$, $\mathrm{M}_a = \widetilde{\Lambda_b}$ and $U(\lambda_B, \mu_A) \leqslant 1$. Hence $s \leqslant \mathrm{b}^{\Lambda_b} - p$, where s is the smallest space of Λ_b. Therefore $b \neq s$, as otherwise we would get $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda - \mathrm{b}_\Lambda = \mathrm{b}^{\Lambda_b} - s \geqslant p$, contrary to the fact that Λ is completely splittable.

Recall that a and b are cogood spaces of M_a and Λ_b respectively, since a and b are good beads of M and Λ respectively. We have $b = \mathrm{b}^{\Lambda_b}(i) + 1 < \mathrm{b}_{\Lambda_b} + p$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant h(\Lambda)$, since $\mathrm{b}_{\Lambda_b} + p$ is not a cogood space of Λ_b. Now Lemma 2.7 can be applied to Λ_b. This yields $\tilde{\Lambda} = \mathrm{M}_a^{b+p\varepsilon_i}$, where $\varepsilon = (-1, 0^{h(\Lambda)-2}, 1)$. Since a and b are in the same runner and the only cogood space of M_a, which is equal to $\widetilde{\Lambda_b}$, being in the same runner as b is the space $b + 1 + p\varepsilon_i$, then $a = b + 1 + p\varepsilon_i$ and $M = \tilde{\Lambda}$. □

4.3 Exact formula. The next lemma shows that Definition 4.2 of a big partition and the map $\lambda \mapsto \tilde{\lambda}$ given in the current paper is equivalent to [S2, Definition 4].

Lemma 4.5. *A partition λ is big if and only if λ is completely splittable of height more than one and $h_{1,1}(\lambda) \geqslant p$. In that case $[\tilde{\lambda}]$ is obtained from $[\lambda]$ by moving all the nodes of the rim p-hook with base $(1, \lambda_1 + h(\lambda) - p)$ from the last row to the first row.*

Proof. The first part follows from $h_{1,1}(\lambda) = \mathrm{b}^\Lambda - c$, where Λ is a proper abacus and c is its smallest space.

Now let λ be a big partition. We put for brevity $h = h(\lambda)$ and $j = \lambda_1 + h - p$. Since $1 \leqslant j \leqslant \lambda_1$, the node $(1, j)$ belongs to $[\lambda]$. We have $\lambda_j^t \leqslant h$. The inequality $\lambda_j^t < h$ would imply $\lambda_h < j$ and $\chi(\lambda) > p$. Hence $\lambda_j^t = h$ and $h_{1,j}(\lambda) = \lambda_1 - j + \lambda_j^t = p$.

Since $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda - p < \mathrm{b}_\Lambda$ and $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda < \mathrm{b}_\Lambda + p$, for each bead d of Λ such that $\mathrm{b}_\Lambda < d < \mathrm{b}^\Lambda$, the numbers of beads preceding d in Λ and $\tilde{\Lambda}$ coincide and the numbers of beads following d in Λ and $\tilde{\Lambda}$ also coincide. The beads $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda - p$ and $\mathrm{b}_\Lambda + p$ are respectively the smallest and the greatest beads of $\tilde{\Lambda}$. There are $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda - p - c = \lambda_1 - 1 + h - p$ spaces in $\tilde{\Lambda}$ preceding the former bead and $\mathrm{b}_\Lambda + p - c - (h - 1) = \lambda_h - h + p + 1$ spaces preceding the latter bead (c is the smallest space of Λ). Thus $\tilde{\lambda} = (\lambda_h - h + p + 1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_{h-1}, \lambda_1 + h - p - 1)$. This is exactly the partition, whose diagram is obtained from $[\lambda]$ by moving all the nodes of the rim p-hook with base $(1, j)$ from the last row to the first row. □

Theorem 4.6. ([S2, Theorem 6]) *Let $p > 2$ and λ, μ be p-regular partitions of n such that D^λ is completely splittable and $\lambda \ntriangleright \mu$. Then*

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu) \cong \begin{cases} K & \textit{if } \mu = \tilde{\lambda}; \\ 0 & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. The equality $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^\mu) = 0$ in the case where λ is not big or $\mu \neq \tilde{\lambda}$ follows from Lemma 4.4 and Proposition 2.3.

Now suppose $\mu = \tilde{\lambda}$. Lemma 4.5 implies that the length of the hook $h_{i,j}(\lambda)$, where $j = \lambda_1 + h(\lambda) - p$ and $1 \leqslant i \leqslant \lambda^t_j = h(\lambda)$ is divisible by p if and only if $i = 1$. Since $h(\lambda) > 1$, the Carter conjecture proved in [JaM] implies that the module S^λ is not simple. By Lemma 4.4, a unique top composition factor of a nonzero module $\operatorname{rad} S^\lambda$ is $D^{\tilde{\lambda}}$. This fact and the second assertion of Lemma 4.4 yield $\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\lambda, D^{\tilde{\lambda}}) = 1$. $\square$

4.4 Almost completely splittable partitions.

Definition 4.7. *An abacus (partition)* M *is called almost completely splittable if* $\mathrm{M} = \tilde{\Lambda}$ *for some completely splittable* Λ*, which is called the preimage of* M.

It is important to notice that the preimage Λ is uniquely determined by M. Indeed, let $a = \mathrm{b}^{\mathrm{M}}$. If M is a completely splittable abacus, then denote by b its greatest improper bead. If M is not a completely splittable abacus, then put $b = \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{M}}$. Then Λ is obtained from M by moving a up and moving b down one position.

A module D^λ, where λ is an almost completely splittable partition, is also called *almost completely splittable*.

It is convenient to define many abaci encountered in this paper with the help of the following construction. Take $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $S \subset [0, p-1]$. Let $x_0, \ldots, x_i, \ldots$ be all the elements of the set $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \geqslant x, \operatorname{rem}(n,p) \in S\}$ written in the ascending order. For $i \geqslant 0$, we put $\langle x, S, i\rangle = \{x_k : i \leqslant k < i + |S|\}$. Note that if $i > 0$ then the set $\langle x, S, i-1\rangle$ is obtained from $\langle x, S, i\rangle$ by replacing the greatest element a of the latter set with $a - p$ (moving a one position up).

Example. Let $p = 7$ and $S = \{1, 3, 4, 6\}$. We have $\langle 9, S, 5\rangle = \{18, 20, 22, 24\}$ and $\langle 9, S, 6\rangle = \{20, 22, 24, 25\}$.

Definition 4.8. *Let h, i, x be integers such that* $0 < i \leqslant h < p$ *and* $x \geqslant 0$. *Define* $\Lambda^{(h,i,x)} = \overline{(-\infty, 0) \cup \langle 0, [0,i), x\rangle \cup [i,h)}$ *and* $\lambda^{(h,i,x)} = P(\Lambda^{(h,i,x)})$.

Clearly, the partition $\lambda^{(h,i,x)}$ has p-weight x and therefore is a partition of px. Moreover, if $x > 0$ the height of $\lambda^{(h,i,x)}$ is h, $\operatorname{core}(\lambda^{(h,i,x)}) = \emptyset$, the top removable node of $\lambda^{(h,i,x)}$ is its only normal node and this node has residue $-\bar{h}$. Obviously the equalities $\lambda^{(h,i,0)} = \emptyset$ and $\lambda^{(h,i,x)} = \lambda^{(h,x,x)}$ (following from $\Lambda^{(h,i,x)} = \Lambda^{(h,x,x)}$) for $x < i$ represent all nontrivial equalities between partitions $\lambda^{(h,i,x)}$. We put for brevity $\lambda^{(H,x)} = \lambda^{(H,H,x)}$. Explicitly $\Lambda^{(h,i,x)}$ is written as

$$\Lambda^{(h,i,x)} = \overline{(-\infty, 0) \cup [(q+1)p, (q+1)p + r) \cup [qp + r, qp + i) \cup [i, h)},$$

where $q = \operatorname{quo}(x, i)$ and $r = \operatorname{rem}(x, i)$.

Remark. In [H], the partitions $\lambda^{(H,x)}$ are called minimal.

Proposition 4.9. *If λ is a completely splittable partition, then* $\chi(\operatorname{core}(\lambda)) < p$.

Proof follows from (4.1) and the fact that $\operatorname{core}(\lambda)$ is completely splittable. $\square$

Lemma 4.10. *Let λ be a completely splittable partition,* $\chi(\lambda) = p$ *and the residue of any* $\operatorname{core}(\lambda)$*-normal node is equal to the residue of the bottom λ-removable node. Then* $\lambda = \lambda^{(H,x)}$*, where* $1 < H < p$ *and* $H \nmid x$.

Proof. Suppose that $\mathrm{core}(\lambda)$ is not empty. Proposition 4.9 implies that $\chi(\mathrm{core}(\lambda)) < p$ and $\mathrm{core}(\lambda)$ contains only one removable node. Hence $\mathrm{core}(\lambda) = P\big(\overline{(-\infty,0)\cup[b,a]}\big)$, where $0 < b \leqslant a < p$. Therefore $\lambda = P\big(\overline{(-\infty,0)\cup[(q+1)p+b,(q+1)p+r)\cup[qp+r,qp+a]}\big)$ for q and r such that $q \geqslant 0$ and $b \leqslant r \leqslant a$.

The case $r = b$ is impossible, as we would get the contradiction $\chi(\lambda) = \chi(\mathrm{core}(\lambda)) < p$. The case $r > b$ is also impossible. Indeed, in this case the smallest initial bead of $\overline{(-\infty,0)\cup[(q+1)p+b,(q+1)p+r)\cup[qp+r,qp+a]}$, which is equal to $qp+r$, and the normal bead b of $\overline{(-\infty,0)\cup[b,a]}$ would belong to different runners. This is a contradiction.

Now the desired assertion follows from $\mathrm{core}(\lambda) = \emptyset$ and $\chi(\lambda) = p$. $\square$

Proposition 4.11. *Let λ be a nonempty partition and Λ be its abacus. Then $\lambda - (1^{h(\lambda)}) = P(\Lambda')$, where Λ' is obtained from Λ by replacing its smallest space by the bead.*

Corollary 4.12. *Let λ and μ be partitions such that $h(\lambda) = h(\mu)$ and $\mathrm{core}(\lambda) = \mathrm{core}(\mu)$. Then $\mathrm{core}(\lambda - (1^{h(\lambda)})) = \mathrm{core}(\mu - (1^{h(\mu)}))$.*

Lemma 4.13. *Let $\chi(\lambda) = p$, $\mathrm{core}(\lambda) = \mathrm{core}(\mu) = \emptyset$, $h(\mu) \leqslant h(\lambda) < p$ and the residue of any μ-normal node is equal to the residue of the bottom λ-removable node. Then $h(\mu) < h(\lambda)$.*

Proof. Suppose $h(\mu) = h(\lambda)$. We put $h = h(\lambda)$ and $n = \sum\lambda$.

Case $n > p$. We have $\lambda = P(\Lambda^{(h,x)})$. We put $\alpha = \mathrm{res}(h,\lambda_h)$, $\bar\lambda = \lambda - (1^h)$ and $\bar\mu = \mu - (1^h)$. In the case under consideration $x > 1$. Therefore $\lambda_h > 1$ and $\chi(\bar\lambda) = p$. By Corollary 5.3, for any $\mathrm{core}(\bar\mu)$-normal node, there is a $\bar\mu$-normal node of the same residue. However all $\bar\mu$-normal nodes have residue $\alpha - 1$, which is equal to the residue of the bottom $\bar\lambda$-removable node $(h, \lambda_h - 1)$. Since $\mathrm{core}(\bar\mu) = \mathrm{core}(\bar\lambda)$ by Corollary 4.12, the residue of any $\mathrm{core}(\bar\lambda)$-normal node is equal to the residue of the bottom $\bar\lambda$-removable node. By Lemma 4.10, we get $\mathrm{core}(\bar\lambda) = \emptyset$, which is a contradiction, since $\bar\lambda$ is a partition of the number $n - h$ not divisible by p.

Case $n = p$ is reduced to the previous one by considering the pair of partitions $\hat\lambda = \lambda + (p^h)$ and $\hat\mu = \mu + (p^h)$. $\square$

5 Removal of locally highest p-hooks

Definition 5.1. *Let u be a movable up bead of Λ. The rim p-hook corresponding to it is called locally highest if $u+1$ is not a movable up bead.*

Lemma 5.2. *Let λ be a partition and $\bar\lambda$ be the partition obtained from λ by removing its locally highest rim p-hook R. Then for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ the number of $\bar\lambda$-normal nodes of residue α does not exceed the number of λ-normal nodes of the same residue.*

Proof. Let Λ and $\bar\Lambda$ be some abaci of λ and $\bar\lambda$ respectively having shifts of p-residue $1-\alpha$. Consider the decomposition $\mathrm{hook}_\Lambda^{-1}(R) = pi + j$, where $0 \leqslant j < p$.

By Proposition 2.4 and the second formula of (2.1), the theorem will be proved if we define an embedding ι of the set of normal beads of the first runner of $\bar\Lambda$ into the set of normal beads of the first runner of Λ. If $j > 1$ then we can take the identity map for ι. Thus we assume $0 \leqslant j \leqslant 1$.

First consider the case $j = 0$. Let $a = px + 1$ be a normal bead of $\bar\Lambda$.

If $x > i$ then a is obviously a normal bead of Λ. In that case we put $\iota(a) = a$.

If $x = i$ then $a - p$ is a bead of Λ, as otherwise it would be possible to move the bead a one position up in Λ, which contradicts the fact that the rim p-hook we have removed is locally highest. Take any $s > i - 1$. We have

$$\sum_{i-1<k\leqslant s}(\Lambda(pk+1)-\Lambda(pk)) = \sum_{i<k\leqslant s}(\Lambda(pk+1)-\Lambda(pk)) = \sum_{i<k\leqslant s}(\bar{\Lambda}(pk+1)-\bar{\Lambda}(pk)) \geqslant 0.$$

Now it is clear that $a - p$ is a normal bead of Λ. We put $\iota(a) = a - p$.

The case $x = i - 1$ is impossible, as otherwise the bead a would not be initial in $\bar{\Lambda}$.

Finally let $x < i - 1$. For any $s > x$, we have $\sum_{x<k\leqslant s}\bar{\Lambda}(pk) \geqslant \sum_{x<k\leqslant s}\Lambda(pk)$ and therefore

$$\sum_{x<k\leqslant s}(\Lambda(pk+1)-\Lambda(pk)) \geqslant \sum_{x<k\leqslant s}(\bar{\Lambda}(pk+1)-\bar{\Lambda}(pk)) \geqslant 0.$$

Thus a is a normal bead of Λ. We put $\iota(a) = a$.

Now consider the case $j = 1$. Define the parameter x_0 as follows. Let $px+1$ and $py+1$ be normal beads of $\bar{\Lambda}$ such that $y < x < i - 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{y<k\leqslant i-1}(\bar{\Lambda}(pk+1)-\bar{\Lambda}(pk)) = \\ &\sum_{y<k\leqslant x-1}(\bar{\Lambda}(pk+1)-\bar{\Lambda}(pk)) + 1 + \sum_{x<k\leqslant i-1}(\bar{\Lambda}(pk+1)-\bar{\Lambda}(pk)) \geqslant 1.\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

Therefore there is at most one number $x_0 < i - 1$ such that $px_0 + 1$ is a normal bead of $\bar{\Lambda}$ and

$$\sum_{x_0<k\leqslant i-1}(\bar{\Lambda}(pk+1)-\bar{\Lambda}(pk)) = 0. \tag{5.2}$$

If there is no such number at all, then we put $x_0 = +\infty$. Under this definition, we get

Basic property of x_0. *Let $px + 1$ be a normal bead of $\bar{\Lambda}$ such that $x < i - 1$. Then $x \leqslant x_0$ and $\sum_{x<k\leqslant i-1}(\bar{\Lambda}(pk+1)-\bar{\Lambda}(pk)) > 0$ if $x \neq x_0$.*

Indeed in the case $x_0 < +\infty$ this fact follows from (5.1). In the case $x_0 = +\infty$ the sum under consideration is not equal to zero by the definition of x_0 and thus is strictly positive.

If $x > i$ then similarly to the previous case we get that a is a normal bead of Λ. We put $\iota(a) = a$.

The case $x = i$ is impossible, as $\bar{\Lambda}(pi+1) = 0$ and $\bar{\Lambda}(px+1) = 1$.

If $x = i - 1$ then $\Lambda(pi) = \bar{\Lambda}(pi) = 0$, because $\bar{\Lambda}(pi+1) = 0$ and $a = p(i-1)+1$ is a normal bead of $\bar{\Lambda}$. Take any $s > i$. We have

$$\sum_{i<k\leqslant s}(\Lambda(pk+1)-\Lambda(pk)) = \sum_{i-1<k\leqslant s}(\bar{\Lambda}(pk+1)-\bar{\Lambda}(pk)) \geqslant 0.$$

Now it is clear that $pi + 1$ is a normal bead of Λ. We put $\iota(a) = pi + 1$.

If $x = x_0$ then by property (5.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}&0 \leqslant \sum_{x_0<k\leqslant i}(\bar{\Lambda}(pk+1)-\bar{\Lambda}(pk)) = -\Lambda(pi)\\ &0 = \sum_{x_0<k\leqslant i-1}(\bar{\Lambda}(pk+1)-\bar{\Lambda}(pk)) = \\ &\sum_{x_0<k\leqslant i-2}(\bar{\Lambda}(pk+1)-\bar{\Lambda}(pk)) + 1 - \Lambda(p(i-1)) \geqslant 1 - \Lambda(p(i-1)).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\Lambda(pi)=0$ and $\Lambda(p(i-1))=1$.

Take any $s>i$. We have

$$\sum_{i<k\leqslant s}(\Lambda(pk+1)-\Lambda(pk))=\sum_{x_0<k\leqslant s}(\bar\Lambda(pk+1)-\bar\Lambda(pk))\geqslant 0.$$

For the last rearrangement, we used property (5.2) and the equalities $\bar\Lambda(pi)=\bar\Lambda(pi+1)=0$. Therefore $pi+1$ is a normal bead of Λ. We put $\iota(a)=pi+1$.

Finally let $x<i-1$ and $x\neq x_0$. Clearly, for an arbitrary $s>x$ not equal to $i-1$ we have

$$\sum_{x<k\leqslant s}(\Lambda(pk+1)-\Lambda(pk))=\sum_{i<k\leqslant s}(\bar\Lambda(pk+1)-\bar\Lambda(pk))\geqslant 0.$$

On the other hand by the basic property of x_0 we have

$$\sum_{x<k\leqslant i-1}(\Lambda(pk+1)-\Lambda(pk))=\sum_{x<k\leqslant i-1}(\bar\Lambda(pk+1)-\bar\Lambda(pk))-1\geqslant 0.$$

Therefore a is a normal bead of Λ. We put $\iota(a)=a$.

The preimage of a bead b belonging to the image of ι, is given by the following formulas:

Case $j>1$: $\iota^{-1}(b)=b$;

Case $j=0$: $\iota^{-1}(b)=\begin{cases} b & \text{if } b\neq p(i-1)+1;\\ pi+1 & \text{if } b=p(i-1)+1,\end{cases}$

Case $j=1$: $\iota^{-1}(b)=\begin{cases} b & \text{if } b\neq pi+1;\\ p(i-1)+1 & \text{if } b=pi+1 \text{ and } \Lambda(p(i-1))=0;\\ px_0+1 & \text{if } b=pi+1 \text{ and } \Lambda(p(i-1))=1.\end{cases}$ $\square$

Corollary 5.3. *Let λ be a partition. For any $\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}_p$, the number of* core(λ)*-normal nodes of residue α does not exceed the number of λ-normal nodes of the same residue.*

Proof follows from the fact that core(λ) can be obtained by removing the highest rim p-hook at each step. $\square$

6 Mullineux map of some partitions

To calculate the Mullineux map of a partition λ, we shall use the Mullineux symbol defined in [BeO], which is the array

$$G_p(\lambda)=\begin{pmatrix}A_0\cdots A_z\\ R_0\cdots R_z\end{pmatrix},$$

where $A_j=e(\varphi^j(\lambda))$, $R_j=h(\varphi^j(\lambda))$ and $\varphi^{z+1}(\lambda)=\emptyset$. The product of such arrays is understood as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix}A_0\cdots A_z\\ R_0\cdots R_z\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}A'_0\cdots A'_{z'}\\ R'_0\cdots R'_{z'}\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}A_0\cdots A_zA'_0\cdots A'_{z'}\\ R_0\cdots R_zR'_0\cdots R'_{z'}\end{pmatrix}.$$

Lemma 6.1. *Let $1<H<p$, $x>0$ and $H\nmid x$. We put $Q=$* quo(x,H) *and $R=$* rem(x,H)*. If $R>1$ then*

$$G_p\left(\widetilde{\lambda^{(H,x)}}\right) = \binom{2p}{H}^Q \binom{p+R-1}{H} \binom{p}{H-1}^{x-2(Q+1)} \binom{p-R+1}{H-R+1}$$

and if $R = 1$ *then*

$$G_p\left(\widetilde{\lambda^{(H,x)}}\right) = \binom{2p}{H}^Q \binom{p}{H-1}^{x-2Q}.$$

Proof. Let $S = [0, H-1] \setminus \{R-1\}$, $\Lambda = \widetilde{\Lambda^{(H,x)}}$ and $\lambda = \widetilde{\lambda^{(H,x)}}$. It is easy to check that

$$\varphi^j(\Lambda) = \overline{(-\infty, 0) \cup \langle 0, \{R-1\}, Q-j\rangle \cup \langle 0, S, x-Q-j\rangle} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leqslant j \leqslant Q.$$

Hence $h(\varphi^j(\lambda)) = H$ and $e(\varphi^j(\lambda)) = 2p$ for $0 \leqslant j < Q$.

Case $R > 1$. Then $h(\varphi^Q(\lambda)) = H$. We have

$$\varphi^{Q+j}(\Lambda) = \overline{(-\infty, 0] \cup \langle 1, S, x-2Q-1-j\rangle} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leqslant j \leqslant x-2Q-1.$$

Hence $e(\varphi^Q(\lambda)) = p+R-1$, $h(\varphi^{Q+j}(\lambda^{(H,x)})) = H-1$, $e(\varphi^{Q+j}(\lambda^{(H,x)})) = p$ for $1 \leqslant j < x-2Q-1$ and $h(\varphi^{x-Q-1}(\lambda^{(H,x)})) = H-R+1$. Finally $\varphi^{x-Q}(\lambda^{(H,x)}) = \emptyset$ and $e(\varphi^{x-Q-1}(\lambda^{(H,x)})) = p-R+1$.

Case $R = 1$. Then $h(\varphi^Q(\lambda)) = H-1$. We have

$$\varphi^{Q+j}(\Lambda) = \overline{(-\infty, 0] \cup \langle 1, S, x-2Q-j\rangle} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant x-2Q.$$

Hence $h(\varphi^{Q+j}(\lambda)) = H-1$ for $1 \leqslant j < x-2Q$, $\varphi^{x-Q}(\lambda) = \emptyset$ and $e(\varphi^{Q+j}(\lambda)) = p$ for $0 \leqslant j < x-2Q$. □

Definition 6.2. *Let* H *and* x *be integers such that* $1 < H < p$, $x > 0$ *and* $H \nmid x$. *Define*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{N}^{(H,x)} &= \overline{(-\infty, H) \cup \langle H, S_1, Q\rangle \cup \langle p+H-R, S_2, x-Q\rangle}, \\ \nu^{(H,x)} &= P(\mathrm{N}^{(H,x)}), \end{aligned}$$

where $Q = \operatorname{quo}(x, H)$, $R = \operatorname{rem}(x, H)$, $S_1 = [0, p-1] \setminus \{H-R\}$ *and* $S_2 = \{H-R\} \cup [H, p-1]$.

To gain a better understanding of the structure of $\mathrm{N}^{(H,x)}$, we introduce the following notation: let $a_0^{(H,x)}$, $a_1^{(H,x)}$, … be all the elements of the set $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \geqslant H, \operatorname{rem}(n, p) \in S_1\}$ and $b_0^{(H,x)}$, $b_1^{(H,x)}$, … be all the elements of the set $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \geqslant p+H-R, \operatorname{rem}(n, p) \in S_2\}$ written in ascending order. An easy verification shows that

$$\begin{aligned} a_y^{(H,x)} &= H + y + \left[\tfrac{R-1+y}{p-1}\right], \\ b_y^{(H,x)} &= p + H - 1 + y + (H-R)\left[\tfrac{y}{p-H+1}\right] + (R-1)\left[\tfrac{y-1}{p-H+1}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Lemma 6.3. *Let* H *and* x *be integers such that* $1 < H < p$, $x > 0$ *and* $H \nmid x$. *Then* $m\left(\widetilde{\lambda^{(H,x)}}\right) = \nu^{(H,x)}$.

Proof. Let Q, R, S_1, S_2 be as in Definition 6.2 and $\mathrm{N} = \mathrm{N}^{(H,x)}$, $\nu = \nu^{(H,x)}$. By the main result of [FK] and Lemma 6.1, it suffices to prove that if $R > 1$ then

$$G_p(\nu) = \binom{2p}{2p-H}^Q \binom{p+R-1}{p+R-H} \binom{p}{p-H+1}^{x-2(Q+1)} \binom{p-R+1}{p-H+1} \tag{6.2}$$

and that if $R = 1$ then

$$G_p(\nu) = \binom{2p}{2p-H}^{Q} \binom{p}{p-H+1}^{x-2Q}. \tag{6.3}$$

Let us see first how the sets $\langle H, S_1, y\rangle$ and $\langle p+H-R, S_2, x-2Q+y\rangle$ are situated with respect to one another. Denote by u_y the greatest element of the former set and by v_y the smallest element of the latter set. We have $u_y = a^{(H,x)}_{y+p-2}$ and $v_y = b^{(H,x)}_{x-2Q+y}$.

For $y \geqslant 0$, it follows from (6.1) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&v_{y-1} - u_y = b^{(H,x)}_{x-2Q+y-1} - a^{(H,x)}_{y+p-2} = \\
&x - 2Q + (H-R)\left[\tfrac{x-2Q+y-1}{p-H+1}\right] + (R-1)\left[\tfrac{x-2Q+y-2}{p-H+1}\right] - \left[\tfrac{R+y+p-3}{p-1}\right] \geqslant \\
&x - 2Q - 1 + \left[\tfrac{x-2Q+y+p-H}{p-H+1}\right] - \left[\tfrac{R+y+p-3}{p-1}\right] + (R-1)\left[\tfrac{x-2Q+y-2}{p-H+1}\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Since $x - 2Q \geqslant R$, the first and the last summands of the last sum are nonnegative for any $y \geqslant 0$. Moreover $p - H + 1 \leqslant p - 1$. If $Q > 0$ then we have $x - 2Q + y + p - H = (H-2)Q + R + y + p - H > p + y + R - 3$ and therefore

$$\left[\tfrac{x-2Q+y+p-H}{p-H+1}\right] \geqslant \left[\tfrac{R+y+p-3}{p-1}\right]. \tag{6.5}$$

For $Q = y = 0$, we get

$$\left[\tfrac{x+p-H}{p-H+1}\right] \geqslant 1 \geqslant \left[\tfrac{R+p-3}{p-1}\right].$$

Thus we have proved that $v_{y-1} \geqslant u_y$ for $0 \leqslant y \leqslant Q$. Recall that if $y \geqslant 0$ then being moved one position up the greatest bead of $\langle p+H-R, S_2, x-2Q+y\rangle$ takes position v_{y-1}.

Now one can clearly see that

$$\varphi^j(\mathrm{N}) = \overline{(-\infty, H) \cup \langle H, S_1, Q-j\rangle \cup \langle p+H-R, S_2, x-Q-j\rangle} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant Q.$$

Hence $h(\varphi^j(\nu)) = 2p - H$ and $e(\varphi^j(\nu)) = 2p$ for $0 \leqslant j < Q$. Moreover $h(\varphi^Q(\nu)) = p + R - H$.

If $R > 1$ then $x - 2Q \geqslant 2$ and

$$\varphi^{Q+j}(\mathrm{N}) = \overline{(-\infty, p+H-1) \cup \langle p+H, S_2, x-2Q-1-j\rangle} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leqslant j \leqslant x-2Q-1.$$

Hence $e(\varphi^Q(\nu)) = p+R-1$, $e(\varphi^{Q+j}(\nu)) = p$ for $1 \leqslant j < x-2Q-1$, $h(\varphi^{Q+j}(\nu)) = p-H+1$ for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant x-2Q-1$, $e(\varphi^{x-Q-1}(\nu)) = p - R + 1$ and $\varphi^{x-Q}(\nu) = \emptyset$.

If $R = 1$ then

$$\varphi^{Q+j}(\mathrm{N}) = \overline{(-\infty, p+H-1) \cup \langle p+H-1, S_2, x-2Q-j\rangle} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant x-2Q.$$

Hence $e(\varphi^{Q+j}(\nu)) = p$ and $h(\varphi^{Q+j}(\nu)) = p - H + 1$ for $0 \leqslant j < x - 2Q$ and $\varphi^{x-Q}(\nu) = \emptyset$.
□

Lemma 6.4. *Let h, i, x be integers such that $0 < i \leqslant h < p$ and $x \geqslant i$. If $i \geqslant h/2$ and $x \geqslant h$ then*

$$G_p(\lambda^{(h,i,x)}) = \binom{A_0 \cdots A_{h-i-1}}{R_0 \cdots R_{h-i-1}} \binom{p}{i}^{x-2(h-i)} \binom{A_0 - 2i \cdots A_{h-i-1} - 2i}{R_0 - \ i\ \cdots R_{h-i-1} - \ i},$$

if $i < h/2$ *and* $x \geqslant 2i$ *then*

$$G_p(\lambda^{(h,i,x)}) = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 \cdots A_{i-1} \\ R_0 \cdots R_{i-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p \\ i \end{pmatrix}^{x-2i} \begin{pmatrix} A_0 - 2(h-i) \cdots A_{i-1} - 2(h-i) \\ R_0 - \ (h-i) \ \cdots R_{i-1} - \ (h-i) \end{pmatrix},$$

if $x < 2i, h$ *then*

$$G_p(\lambda^{(h,i,x)}) = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 \cdots A_{x-i-1} \\ R_0 \cdots R_{x-i-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p \\ i+h-x \end{pmatrix}^{2i-x} \begin{pmatrix} A_0 - 2(i+h-x) \cdots A_{x-i-1} - 2(i+h-x) \\ R_0 - \ (i+h-x) \ \cdots R_{x-i-1} - \ (i+h-x) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $A_j = p + h - 1 - 2j$ *and* $R_j = h - j$*,*

Proof. Let $S = [0, i-1]$, $\Lambda = \Lambda^{(h,i,x)}$ and $\lambda = \lambda^{(h,i,x)}$.

Case $i \geqslant h/2$ and $x \geqslant h$. For $0 \leqslant j < h - i$, we have $x - j - 1 \geqslant x - h + i \geqslant i$ and therefore the first element of the set $\langle 0, S, x-j-1 \rangle$ is not less than p. Hence

$$\varphi^j(\Lambda) = \overline{(-\infty, j) \cup \langle 0, S, x-j \rangle \cup [i, h-j)} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant h-i.$$

Therefore $h(\varphi^j(\lambda)) = R_j$ for $0 \leqslant j \leqslant h - i$ and $e(\varphi^j(\lambda)) = A_j$ for $0 \leqslant j < h - i$. Next we have

$$\varphi^{h-i+j}(\Lambda) = \overline{(-\infty, h-i) \cup \langle h-i, S, x-2(h-i)-j \rangle} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant x - 2(h-i).$$

Hence $e(\varphi^{h-i+j}(\lambda)) = p$ for $0 \leqslant j < x - 2(h-i)$, $h(\varphi^{h-i+j}(\lambda)) = i$ for $1 \leqslant j < x - 2(h-i)$ and $h(\varphi^{x-(h-i)}(\lambda)) = h - i$. Finally

$$\varphi^{x-(h-i)+j}(\Lambda) = \overline{(-\infty, i+j) \cup [p, p+h-i-j)} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant h-i.$$

Hence $e(\varphi^{x-(h-i)+j}(\lambda)) = A_j - 2i$ for $0 \leqslant j < h - i$ and $h(\varphi^{x-(h-i)+j}(\lambda)) = R_j - i$ for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant h - i$.

Case $i < h/2$ and $x \geqslant 2i$. For $0 \leqslant j < i$, we have $x - j - 1 \geqslant i$ and therefore the first element of the set $\langle 0, S, x-j-1 \rangle$ is not less than p. Hence we get

$$\varphi^j(\Lambda) = \overline{(-\infty, j) \cup \langle 0, S, x-j \rangle \cup [i, h-j)} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant i.$$

Therefore $h(\varphi^j(\lambda)) = R_j$ and $e(\varphi^j(\lambda)) = A_j$ for $0 \leqslant j < i$. Next

$$\varphi^{i+j}(\Lambda) = \overline{(-\infty, h-i) \cup \langle p, S, x-2i-j \rangle} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant x - 2i.$$

Hence $e(\varphi^{i+j}(\lambda)) = p$ and $h(\varphi^{i+j}(\lambda)) = i$ for $0 \leqslant j < x - 2i$. Finally

$$\varphi^{x-i+j}(\Lambda) = \overline{(-\infty, h-i+j) \cup [p, p+i-j)} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant i.$$

Hence $e(\varphi^{x-i+j}(\lambda)) = A_j - 2(h-i)$ for $0 \leqslant j < i$ and $h(\varphi^{x-i+j}(\lambda)) = R_j - (h-i)$ for $0 \leqslant j \leqslant i$.

Case $x < 2i, h$. For $0 \leqslant j < x - i$, we have $x - j - 1 \geqslant i$ and therefore the first element of the set $\langle 0, S, x-j-1 \rangle$ is not less than p. Hence

$$\varphi^j(\Lambda) = \overline{(-\infty, j) \cup \langle 0, S, x-j \rangle \cup [i, h-j)} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant x-i$$

Therefore $h(\varphi^j(\lambda)) = R_j$ for $0 \leqslant j \leqslant x - i$ and $e(\varphi^j(\lambda)) = A_j$ for $0 \leqslant j < x - i$. Next

$$\varphi^{x-i+j}(\Lambda) = \overline{(-\infty, x-i) \cup \langle x-i, S, 2i-x-j \rangle \cup [h, h-x+i)} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant 2i - x.$$

Hence $e(\varphi^{x-i+j}(\lambda)) = p$ for $0 \leqslant j < 2i-x$ and $h(\varphi^{x-i+j}(\lambda)) = i+h-x$ for $1 \leqslant j < 2i-x$. Finally

$$\varphi^{i+j}(\Lambda) = \overline{(-\infty, h-x+i+j) \cup [p, p+x-i-j)} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant x-i.$$

Hence $e(\varphi^{i+j}(\lambda)) = A_j - 2(i+h-x)$ for $0 \leqslant j < x-i$ and $h(\varphi^{i+j}(\lambda)) = R_j - (i+h-x)$ for $0 \leqslant j \leqslant x-i$. ☐

Definition 6.5. *Let h, i, x be integers such that $0 < i \leqslant h < p$ and $x \geqslant i$. Define*

$$\mathrm{M}^{(h,i,x)} = \overline{(-\infty, p) \cup [p+h-m, p+h) \cup \langle p, S, x\rangle},$$
$$\mu^{(h,i,x)} = P(\mathrm{M}^{(h,i,x)}),$$

where $m = \max\{i, i+h-x\}$ and $S = [0, h-m) \cup [h, p-1]$.

Let $c_0^{(h,i,x)}$, $c_1^{(h,i,x)}$, …be all the elements of the set $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \geqslant p, \mathrm{rem}(n,p) \in S\}$ written in ascending order. An easy verification shows that

$$c_y^{(h,i,x)} = p+y+m+m\left[\tfrac{y+m-h}{p-m}\right]. \tag{6.6}$$

Lemma 6.6. *Let h, i, x be integers such that $0 < i \leqslant h < p$ and $x \geqslant i$. Then $m(\lambda^{(h,i,x)}) = \mu^{(h,i,x)}$.*

Proof. Let m and S be as in Definition 6.5, A_j and R_j as in Lemma 6.4 and $\mathrm{M} = \mathrm{M}^{(h,i,x)}$, $\mu = \mu^{(h,i,x)}$, $S_j = p-j$.

Case $i \geqslant h/2$ and $x \geqslant h$. Then $m = i$. We have

$$2p > A_0 > \cdots > A_{h-i-1} > p > A_0 - 2i > \cdots > A_{h-i-1} - 2i > 0.$$

Therefore by the main result of [FK] and Lemma 6.4, it suffices to prove that

$$G_p(\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 \cdots A_{h-i-1} \\ S_0 \cdots S_{h-i-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p \\ p-i \end{pmatrix}^{x-2(h-i)} \begin{pmatrix} A_0 - 2i \cdots A_{h-i-1} - 2i \\ S_0 - \ i \ \cdots S_{h-i-1} - \ i \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $x - 2(h-i) \geqslant 0$. Therefore for $0 \leqslant j < h-i$ we have $x-j-1 \geqslant h-i$ and thus the first element of the set $\langle p, S, x-j-1\rangle$ is not less than $p+h$. Hence we have

$$\varphi^j(\mathrm{M}) = \overline{(-\infty, p+j) \cup [p+h-i, p+h-j) \cup \langle p, S, x-j\rangle} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant h-i.$$

Therefore $e(\varphi^j(\mu)) = A_j$ and $h(\varphi^j(\mu)) = S_j$ for $0 \leqslant j < h-i$. Next

$$\varphi^{h-i+j}(\mathrm{M}) = \overline{(-\infty, p+i) \cup \langle p+h, S, x-2(h-i)-j\rangle} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant x-2(h-i).$$

Hence $e(\varphi^{h-i+j}(\mu)) = p$ and $h(\varphi^{h-i+j}(\mu)) = p-i$ for $0 \leqslant j < x-2(h-i)$. We have

$$\varphi^{x-(h-i)+j}(\mathrm{M}) = \overline{(-\infty, p+i+j) \cup [p+h, 2p+h-i-j)} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant h-i.$$

Hence $e(\varphi^{x-(h-i)+j}(\mu)) = A_j - 2i$ and $h(\varphi^{x-(h-i)+j}(\mu)) = S_j - i$ for $0 \leqslant j < h-i$ and $\varphi^x(\mu) = \emptyset$.

Case $i < h/2$ and $x \geqslant 2i$. We have

$$2p > A_0 > \cdots > A_{i-1} > p > A_0 - 2(h-i) > \cdots > A_{i-1} - 2(h-i) > 0.$$

Therefore by the main result of [FK] and Lemma 6.4, it suffices to prove that

$$G_p(\mu) = \binom{A_0 \cdots A_{i-1}}{S_0 \cdots S_{i-1}} \binom{p}{p-i}^{x-2i} \binom{A_0 - 2i \cdots A_{i-1} - 2(h-i)}{S_0 - \ i \ \cdots S_{i-1} - \ (h-i)}.$$

For $0 \leqslant j < i$, we have $x - j - 1 \geqslant h - m$. Therefore the first element of the set $\langle p, S, x-j-1 \rangle$ is not less than $p + h$. Hence we get

$$\varphi^j(\mathrm{M}) = \overline{(-\infty, p+j) \cup [p+h-m, p+h-j) \cup \langle p, S, x-j \rangle} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant i.$$

Therefore $e(\varphi^j(\mu)) = A_j$ and $h(\varphi^j(\mu)) = S_j$ for $0 \leqslant j < i$. For $0 \leqslant j \leqslant x - 2i$, we have

$$\varphi^{i+j}(\mathrm{M}) = \begin{cases} \overline{(-\infty, p+i) \cup [p+x-i-j, p+h-i) \cup [p+h, 2p+x-i-j)} & \text{if } x < h; \\ \overline{(-\infty, p+i) \cup \langle p+i, S, x-2i-j \rangle} & \text{if } x \geqslant h. \end{cases}$$

Hence $e(\varphi^{i+j}(\mu)) = p$ and $h(\varphi^{i+j}(\mu)) = p - i$ for $0 \leqslant j < x - 2i$. Finally

$$\varphi^{x-i+j}(\mathrm{M}) = \overline{(-\infty, p+h-i+j) \cup [p+h, 2p+i-1-j]} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant i.$$

Hence $e(\varphi^{x-i+j}(\mu)) = A_j - 2(h-i)$, $h(\varphi^{x-i+j}(\mu)) = S_j - (h-i)$ for $0 \leqslant j < i$ and $\varphi^x(\mu) = \emptyset$.

Case $x < 2i, h$. Then $m = i + h - x$. We have

$$2p > A_0 > \cdots > A_{x-i-1} > p > A_0 - 2(i+h-x) > \cdots > A_{x-i-1} - 2(i+h-x) > 0.$$

Therefore by the main result of [FK] and Lemma 6.4, it suffices to prove that

$$G_p(\mu) = \binom{A_0 \cdots A_{x-i-1}}{S_0 \cdots S_{x-i-1}} \binom{p}{p-(i+h-x)}^{2i-x} \binom{A_0 - 2(i+h-x) \cdots A_{x-i-1} - 2(i+h-x)}{S_0 - \ (i+h-x) \ \cdots S_{x-i-1} - \ (i+h-x)}.$$

For $0 \leqslant j < x - i$, we have $x - j - 1 \geqslant i > x - i$ and therefore the first element of the set $\langle p, S, x-j-1 \rangle$ is not less than $p + h$. Hence we get

$$\varphi^j(\mathrm{M}) = \overline{(-\infty, p+j) \cup [p+x-i, p+h-j) \cup \langle p, S, x-j \rangle} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant x-i.$$

Therefore $e(\varphi^j(\mu)) = A_j$ and $h(\varphi^j(\mu)) = S_j$ for $0 \leqslant j < x - i$. Next

$$\varphi^{x-i+j}(\mathrm{M}) = \overline{(-\infty, p+i+h-x) \cup \langle p+h, S, 2i-x-j \rangle} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant 2i-x.$$

Hence $e(\varphi^{x-i+j}(\mu)) = p$ and $h(\varphi^{x-i+j}(\mu)) = p - (i+h-x)$ for $0 \leqslant j < 2i - x$. Finally

$$\varphi^{i+j}(\mathrm{M}) = \overline{(-\infty, p+i+h-x+j) \cup [p+h, 2p+x-i-1-j]} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant x-i.$$

Hence $e(\varphi^{i+j}(\mu)) = A_j - 2(i+h-x)$ and $h(\varphi^{i+j}(\mu)) = S_j - (i+h-x)$ for $0 \leqslant j < x - i$ and $\varphi^x(\mu) = \emptyset$. □

It is interesting to look at the partitions $\nu(2,x)$, when $p > 2$ and x is an odd number greater than 2. By Lemmas 6.3 and 6.6, we get $m\big(\widetilde{\lambda^{(2,x)}}\big) = \nu^{(2,x)}$ and $m(\lambda^{(2,x)}) = \mu^{(2,2,x)} = \lambda^{(p-2,x)}$. We have $h(\nu^{(2,x)}) = 2p - 2$ and $h(\lambda^{(p-2,x)}) = p - 2$. Hence $\nu^{(2,x)} \not\trianglerighteq \lambda^{(p-2,x)}$ and $(\nu^{(2,x)})^t \not\trianglelefteq (\lambda^{(p-2,x)})^t$. Since simple Σ_{px}-modules are self-dual, by Theorem 4.6 (or [KSh2, Theorem 3.5(iv)]), [KN, Theorem 4.4(b)] and Propositions [J, II.2.14(4)], [D, 2.1f], we have

$$\begin{aligned} K &\cong \mathrm{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{px}}\Big(D^{\widetilde{\lambda^{(2,x)}}}, D^{\lambda^{(2,x)}}\Big) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^1_{S(N,px)}\Big(L\big((\nu^{(2,x)})^t\big), L\big((\lambda^{(p-2,x)})^t\big)\Big) \\ &\cong \mathrm{Hom}_{S(N,px)}\Big(\mathrm{rad}\,\Delta\big((\nu^{(2,x)})^t\big), L\big((\lambda^{(p-2,x)})^t\big)\Big), \end{aligned}$$

where $N \geqslant px$ and $S(N, px)$ denotes the Schur algebra. Definition 6.2 and (6.1) show that $\nu^{(2,x+2(p-1))} = \nu^{(2,x)} + (p^{2p-2})$. Applying Corollary 5(4), Theorem 4(a) and Lemma 4 from [S1], we obtain a negative solution of Problem 2 from [S1] for the following values of the parameters: $\lambda := \nu^{(2,3)}$, $q_i := pi$, $n := 2p-2$, $V_i := \operatorname{rad} S^{\lambda+(q_i^n)}$.

In the remaining part of this section, we fix integers H, x, i such that $1 < H < p$, $H \nmid x$ and $0 < i \leqslant x, h$, where $h = H - \operatorname{rem}(x, H)$. Let also $Q = \operatorname{quo}(x, H)$, $R = \operatorname{rem}(x, H)$, $m = \max\{i, i+h-x\}$, $S_1 = [0, p-1] \setminus \{h\}$, $S_2 = \{h\} \cup [H, p-1]$ and $S = [0, h-m) \cup [h, p-1]$.

Lemma 6.7.
(a) *if* $c_y^{(h,i,x)} \geqslant b_z^{(H,x)}$ *and* $y, z > 0$*, then* $c_{y-1}^{(h,i,x)} \geqslant b_{z-1}^{(H,x)}$*;*
(b) *if* $a_y^{(h,i,x)} \leqslant z$ *and* $y > 0$*, then* $a_{y-1}^{(h,i,x)} \leqslant z-1$*;*
(c) *if* $a_y^{(h,i,x)} > z$*, and* $y \geqslant m-1$*,* $0 \leqslant m \leqslant p$*, then* $a_{y-j}^{(h,i,x)} \geqslant z-j$ *for* $0 \leqslant j < m$*.*

Proof follows from the mutual situation of the sets S, S_1, S_2. □

Theorem 6.8. *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) $m\widetilde{\left(\lambda^{(H,x)}\right)} \trianglelefteq m(\lambda^{(h,i,x)})$;

(2) $m\left[\frac{p-h+x-1}{p-m}\right] \geqslant H - Q - 1 + h\left[\frac{x-Q-1}{p-H+1}\right] + (R-1)\left[\frac{x-Q-2}{p-H+1}\right]$.

Proof. Since $\operatorname{shift}(\mathrm{N}^{(H,x)}) = \operatorname{shift}(\mathrm{M}^{(h,i,x)}) = 2p$ (we added one more row in the definition of $\mathrm{M}^{(h,i,x)}$ just to ensure this equality), the first formula of (2.1) and Lemmas 6.3 and 6.6 show that condition (1) of the current theorem is equivalent to $u \trianglelefteq v$, where

$$u = (b_{x-Q+p-H}^{(H,x)}, \dots, b_{x-Q}^{(H,x)}, a_{Q+p-2}^{(H,x)}, \dots, a_Q^{(H,x)}, H-1\dots, 0),$$

$$v = (c_{x+p-m-1}^{(h,i,x)}, \dots, c_x^{(h,i,x)}, p+h-1, \dots, p+h-m, p-1, \dots, 0).$$

It is easy to see that condition (2) of the current theorem is equivalent to $u_1 \leqslant v_1$. Therefore (1) implies (2).

Now suppose that condition (2) is satisfied. Note that $m \leqslant h < H$ and thus $p - m \geqslant p - H + 1$. By the equivalence of the previous paragraph and Lemma 6.7(a), we get $u_j \leqslant v_j$ for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant p - H + 1$.

Now let $p - H + 1 < j \leqslant p - m$. By (6.1) and (6.6), we have

$$v_j - u_j = c_{x+p-m-j}^{(h,i,x)} - a_{Q+2p-H-j}^{(H,x)} = x - Q + m\left[\frac{x+p-j-h}{p-m}\right] - \left[\frac{2p-1+Q-j-h}{p-1}\right]$$

$$= x - Q - 1 + m\left[\frac{x+p-j-h}{p-m}\right] - \left[\frac{p+Q-j-h}{p-1}\right].$$

Since $m \geqslant 1$, $p - m \leqslant p - 1$ and $(x + p - j - h) - (p + Q - j - h) = x - Q > 0$, we have

$$m\left[\frac{x+p-j-h}{p-m}\right] \geqslant \left[\frac{p+Q-j-h}{p-1}\right]$$

and $v_j \geqslant u_j$.

Case 1: $m = 0$ or $m > 0$, $v_{p-m+1} \geqslant u_{p-m+1}$. By Lemma 6.7(b), we get $v_j \geqslant u_j$ for $p-m < j \leqslant p$. Thus we have proved $v_j \geqslant u_j$ for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant p$. We have $v_j \leqslant u_j$ for $p < j \leqslant 2p$, since v_j is an improper bead of $\mathrm{M}^{(h,i,x)}$ for such j. Hence $\sigma_j(v) - \sigma_j(u) \geqslant \sigma_{2p}(v) - \sigma_{2p}(u) = 0$ for any $p \leqslant j \leqslant 2p$. Therefore $u \trianglelefteq v$.

Case 2: $m > 0$ and $v_{p-m+1} < u_{p-m+1}$. By Lemma 6.7(c), we get $v_j \leqslant u_j$ for $p - m < j \leqslant p$. We have $v_j \leqslant u_j$ for $p < j \leqslant 2p$, since v_j is an improper bead of $\mathrm{M}^{(h,i,x)}$ for such j. Hence $\sigma_j(v) - \sigma_j(u) \geqslant \sigma_{2p}(v) - \sigma_{2p}(u) = 0$ for any $p - m \leqslant j \leqslant 2p$. Therefore $u \trianglelefteq v$. $\square$

Remark. The only fact we will need is that (1) implies (2). The reverse implication has been proved only to show the impossibility of improving the bounds by replacing a simpler condition (2) with a more complicated condition (1).

7 Auxiliary upper bound

7.1 Systems. Introduce the following *staircase* abaci and partitions. Let $k \geqslant 0$ and $0 < r_2 < \cdots < r_k < p$, $i_1 > \cdots > i_{k-1} \geqslant 0$ be some integers. We put

$$\mathrm{St}(r_2, \ldots, r_k; i_1, \ldots, i_{k-1}) =$$

$$\overline{(-\infty, 0) \cup [pi_1, pi_1 + r_2) \cup\ [pi_2 + r_2, pi_2 + r_3) \cup \cdots [pi_{k-1} + r_{k-1}, pi_{k-1} + r_k)},$$

$$\mathrm{st}(r_2, \ldots, r_k; i_1, \ldots, i_{k-1}) = P(\mathrm{St}(r_2, \ldots, r_k; i_1, \ldots, i_{k-1})).$$

For $k = 1$, we assume $\mathrm{St}(\emptyset; \emptyset) = \overline{(-\infty, 0)}$ and $\mathrm{st}(\emptyset; \emptyset) = \emptyset$.

We have already met special cases of staircase abaci in § 6. Indeed, let h, i, x be integers such that $0 < i \leqslant h < p$ and $x \geqslant 0$. We put $q = \mathrm{quo}(x, i)$ and $r = \mathrm{rem}(x, i)$. Then

$$\Lambda^{(h,i,x)} = \begin{cases} \mathrm{St}(i, h; q, 0) & \text{if } r = 0; \\ \mathrm{St}(r, i, h; q + 1, q, 0) & \text{if } r > 0. \end{cases} \tag{7.1}$$

Lemma 7.1. *Every solution of the system*

$$\begin{cases} h(\lambda) < p, \\ \mathrm{core}(\lambda) = \emptyset, \\ \mathrm{res}\, A = \mathrm{res}\, B \textit{ for any } \lambda\textit{-normal nodes } A \textit{ and } B. \end{cases} \tag{7.2}$$

has the form $\mathrm{st}(r_2, \ldots, r_k; i_1, \ldots, i_{k-1})$.

Proof. Clearly, these partitions satisfy the system. Prove the converse fact by induction on the number n of nodes in $[\lambda]$. This is obviously true for $n = 0$. Now let $n > 0$ and λ be a solution of system (7.2). Since $\lambda \neq \emptyset = \mathrm{core}(\lambda)$, there is at least one rim p-hook of λ. Denote by $\bar{\lambda}$ the partition obtained from λ by removing the highest of these hooks. By Lemma 5.2, the partition $\bar{\lambda}$ also satisfies system (7.2). By the inductive hypothesis, $\bar{\lambda} = \mathrm{st}(r_2, \ldots, r_k; i_1, \ldots, i_{k-1})$.

Take the abacus Λ such that

$$\lambda = P(\Lambda) \text{ and } \mathrm{shift}(\Lambda) = \mathrm{shift}(\mathrm{St}(r_2, \ldots, r_k; i_1, \ldots, i_{k-1})).$$

We see that there is a movable down bead a of $\mathrm{St}(r_2, \ldots, r_k; i_1, \ldots, i_{k-1})$ such that Λ is obtained from $\mathrm{St}(r_2, \ldots, r_k; i_1, \ldots, i_{k-1})$ by moving a one position down.

Case $k = 1$. Since $h(\lambda) < p$, we have $-p < a < 0$ and $\lambda = \mathrm{st}(1, -a; 1, 0)$ for $a < -1$ and $\lambda = \mathrm{st}(1; 1)$ for $a = -1$.

Case $k > 1$. We can assume $i_1 > 0$, as otherwise $\bar{\lambda} = \emptyset$ and we are under the conditions of the previous case. Since $h(\lambda) < p$, we have $r_k - p < a$. If $a < -1$ or $a \leqslant -1$ and

$i_k > 1$, then Λ contains the following two normal beads in different runners: pi_1 and $a+p$. Therefore, the third equation of system (7.2) is violated for λ and this case is impossible. If $a=-1$ and $i_k=1$, then $\lambda=\mathrm{st}(r_2+1,\dots,r_k+1;i_1,\dots,i_{k-1})$ $(k=2,3)$.

Now suppose that $a \geqslant 0$. Since the third equation of system (7.2) holds for λ, a can take only the following values: pi_t+r_t, where $t=1,\ \dots,\ k-1$ and we assume $r_1=0$. Otherwise pi_1 and $a+p$ would be normal beads of Λ from different runners. Now directly from the definition of staircase abacus one can see that λ has the desired form. $\square$

Let us calculate $e(\mathrm{st}(r_2,\dots,r_k;i_1,\dots,i_{k-1}))$. It is zero for $k=1$. Therefore consider the case $k>1$. Define the sequence $1=a_1<\dots<a_l\leqslant k-1$ by the following rule: $a_{j+1}=a_j+1$ if $a_j+1\leqslant k-1$ and $i_{a_j+1}<i_{a_j}-1$; $a_{j+1}=a_j+2$ if $a_j+2\leqslant k-1$ and $i_{a_j+1}=i_{a_j}-1$. From the definition of § 2.4, we get

$$e(\mathrm{st}(r_2,\dots,r_k;i_1,\dots,i_{k-1}))=\begin{cases} pl & \text{if } i_{a_l}>0;\\ p(l-1)+r_k-1 & \text{if } i_{a_l}=0.\end{cases}$$

Therefore if $e(\lambda)<2p$ and λ is a staircase partition, then λ has one of the following forms: $\emptyset$, $\mathrm{st}(r_2,r_3;i_1,0)$, $\mathrm{st}(r_2,r_3,r_4,;i_1,i_1-1,0)$. This fact and (7.1) yield

Lemma 7.2. *Every solution of the system*

$$\begin{cases} h(\lambda)<p,\\ \mathrm{core}(\lambda)=\emptyset,\\ \mathrm{res}\,A=\mathrm{res}\,B \text{ for any } \lambda\text{-normal nodes } A \text{ and } B,\\ h(\lambda)+h(m(\lambda))<2p.\end{cases} \tag{7.3}$$

has the form $\lambda^{(h,i,x)}$*, where* $0<i\leqslant h<p$ *and* $x\geqslant 0$*.*

The last inequalities can be strengthen by $i\leqslant x$.

7.2 Bound. We state the following known result.

Proposition 7.3. *Let* $n>2$ *and* V *be a* $K\Sigma_{n-1}$*-module. Then*

(a) $V{\uparrow}^{\Sigma_n}\otimes\mathrm{sgn}_n\cong(V\otimes\mathrm{sgn}_{n-1}){\uparrow}^{\Sigma_n}$;

(b) $(\mathrm{Ind}^{\alpha}V)\otimes\mathrm{sgn}_n\cong\mathrm{Ind}^{-\alpha}(V\otimes\mathrm{sgn}_{n-1})$.

Proof. (a) The isomorphism is given by $(\sigma_i\otimes v)\otimes u\mapsto\sigma_i\otimes(v\otimes u)$, where $\sigma_1,\ \dots,\ \sigma_n$ are representatives of the left cosets of Σ_n over Σ_{n-1} having the same sign, $v\in V$ and u is a basis of the sign representation of Σ_n.

(b) follows from (a) and the arguments from the proof of [K2, Theorem 4.7] applied to the induction operator instead of the restriction operator. $\square$

Definition 7.4. *Let* $\pi(H,x,i)$ *be satisfied if and only if*

(1) $H,x,i\in\mathbb{Z}$, $2<H<p$, $H\nmid x$, $0<i\leqslant x,h$ *and* $x>2$;

(2) $m\left\lceil\frac{p-h+x-1}{p-m}\right\rceil\geqslant H-Q-1+h\left\lceil\frac{x-Q-1}{p-H+1}\right\rceil+(R-1)\left\lceil\frac{x-Q-2}{p-H+1}\right\rceil$,

where $Q=\mathrm{quo}(x,H)$*,* $R=\mathrm{rem}(x,H)$*,* $h=H-R$ *and* $m=\max\{i,i+h-x\}$*.*

Definition 7.5. *Let H, x, i be integers for which $\pi(H,x,i)$ is satisfied. Denote by $\varepsilon(H,x,i)$ the sequence such that $-R + \Lambda^{(h,i,x)} = \mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon(H,x,i)}(\Lambda^{(H,x)})$, where $R = \operatorname{rem}(x,H)$ and $h = H - R$.*

Clearly the required sequence $\varepsilon(H,x,i)$ exists and is given by

$$\varepsilon(H,x,i) = \big((-Q-1)^R, (-Q)^{h-i}, (q-Q)^{i-r}, (q+1-Q)^r\big),$$

where $Q = \operatorname{quo}(x,H)$, $R = \operatorname{rem}(x,H)$, $h = H - R$, $q = \operatorname{quo}(x,i)$, $r = \operatorname{rem}(x,i)$.

Definition 7.6. *A pair (ν,μ) is called minimal if*

- *ν is an almost completely splittable partition;*
- *μ is a p-regular partition;*
- *$\nu \not\trianglerighteq \mu$ and $\nu \sim \mu$;*
- *for any μ-good node A there exists a ν-good node B such that $\operatorname{res} B = \operatorname{res} A$ and ν_B is not an almost completely splittable partition.*

It follows directly from the definition that if B is a ν-normal node, ν is an almost completely splittable partition and ν_B is not, then $\chi(\lambda) = p$ and $B = (1, \nu_1)$, where λ is the preimage of ν. Therefore if (ν,μ) is a minimal pair, then all μ-normal nodes have residue $\overline{\nu_1 - 1} = \overline{\lambda_1}$.

Lemma 7.7. *Let (ν,μ) be a minimal pair of partitions of n. We put $x = n/p$ and $H = h(\lambda)$, where λ is the preimage of ν. Suppose that (ν,μ) is different from $(\widetilde{(p^2,p^2-p)}, (2p^2-p))$ and from $(\widetilde{\lambda^{(H,2)}}, \lambda^{(H-2,2)})$ and that $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\nu, D^\mu) \neq 0$. Then $\nu = \widetilde{\lambda^{(H,x)}}$ and $\mu = \lambda^{(H-\operatorname{rem}(x,H),i,x)}$, where $\pi(H,x,i)$ is satisfied.*

Proof. Let α be the residue of all μ-normal nodes and A be a ν-good node of residue α. We have $n \geqslant p > 2$. Since $h(\nu) < p$, by Proposition 2.2, we have

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_n}(\operatorname{rad} S^\nu, D^\mu) \cong \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\nu, D^\mu) \neq 0.$$

Hence $\nu \lhd \mu$ and in particular $h(\mu) \leqslant h(\nu)$. Let $\nu = \tilde{\lambda}$, where λ is a big partition. Since ν_A is not almost completely splittable, we get $\chi(\lambda) = p$ and A is in the first row.

We have $h(\nu) \leqslant h(\lambda)$. Suppose $h(\nu) < h(\lambda)$. Then ν is completely splittable. By the hypothesis of the current theorem and Theorem 4.6, we get that ν is a big partition and $\mu = \tilde{\nu}$. The rightmost node A' of the first row of $[\mu]$ is removable and therefore is normal. However $\operatorname{res} A'$ is equal to the residue of the rightmost node of the last row of $[\nu]$, which is distinct from $\operatorname{res} A$, as ν is completely splittable and $h(\nu) > 1$. The resulting contradiction gives $h(\nu) = h(\lambda)$.

By Corollary 5.3, the residue of any $\operatorname{core}(\mu)$-normal node, and by $\lambda \sim \mu$ also of any $\operatorname{core}(\lambda)$-normal node, is $\operatorname{res} A$, which in turn equals the residue of the bottom λ-removable node. By Lemma 4.10, we have $\lambda = \lambda^{(H,x)}$, $1 < H < p$, $x > 0$ and $H \nmid x$. The case $x = 1$ is impossible, as we would have a contradiction $h(\nu) < h(\lambda)$. Thus $x > 1$. By Lemma 4.13, we get $h(\mu) < h(\lambda) = H$. We put $Q = \operatorname{quo}(x,H)$, $R = \operatorname{rem}(x,H)$ and $h = H - R$.

If $R > 1$ we put $b = (Q+1)p$ and if $R = 1$ we put $b = Qp$. Since $x > 1$, we get that b is the only normal and thus good bead of $\widetilde{\Lambda^{(H,x)}}$ belonging to runner zero .

Denote by B the node of ν corresponding to b. By the second formula of (2.1), we have $\operatorname{res} B = -\overline{\operatorname{shift}(\Lambda^{(H,x)})} = -\bar{H}$. By Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\begin{gathered}0 < \dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\nu, D^\mu) \leqslant \\ \dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(D^{\nu_B}, \operatorname{Res}_{-\bar{H}} D^\mu) + \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^{-\bar{H}} D^{\nu_B}, D^\mu).\end{gathered}$$

Since $\alpha = \bar{R} - \bar{H} \neq -\bar{H}$, the hypothesis of the current theorem yields $\operatorname{Res}_{-\bar{H}} D^\mu = 0$. Hence $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n-1}}(\operatorname{rad} \operatorname{Ind}^{-\bar{H}} D^{\nu_B}, D^\mu) \neq 0$ and in particular $[\operatorname{Ind}^{-\bar{H}} D^{\nu_B} : D^\mu] > 0$. Multiplying the modules from the last inequality by sgn_n, we get by Proposition 7.3(b) that

$$[\operatorname{Ind}^{\bar{H}} D^{m(\nu_B)} : D^{m(\mu)}] > 0. \tag{7.4}$$

It follows from the proof of [K2, Theorem 4.7] that $m(\nu_B) = m(\nu)_{B^{(m)}}$, where $B^{(m)}$ is the $m(\nu)$-good node of residue $\bar{H}$. By Lemma 6.3, we get $m(\nu) = P(\mathrm{N}^{(H,x)})$. For brevity until the end of the current proof we shall use the notation $\mathrm{N} = \mathrm{N}^{(H,x)}$, $a_i = a_i^{(H,x)}$, $b_i = b_i^{(H,x)}$ (see Definition 6.2 and (6.1)). We shall prove that $m(\nu) \trianglelefteq m(\mu)$.

Case 1: $R > 1$. We have $a_{Q+p-1} < b_{x-Q}$. Indeed if $Q > 0$, then taking into account (6.5) the substitution $y = Q + 1$ into (6.4) yields $b_{x-Q} - a_{Q+p-1} \geqslant x - 2Q - 1 \geqslant R - 1 > 0$. On the other hand, if $Q = 0$ then $a_{Q+p-1} = H + p < b_x = b_{x-Q}$, since $x > 1$.

Denote by $b^{(m)}$ the element of $\langle p + H - R, S_2, x - Q\rangle$ from runner H. Clearly, $b^{(m)}$ is a normal bead of N. The only initial bead of N distinct from $b^{(m)}$ and belonging to runner H is a_Q in the case where $Q > 0$ and $p - 1 \mid Q$. However this bead is not normal, as in this case $a_Q + p - 1 = a_{Q+p-2}$ and $a_Q + p = a_{Q+p-1} < b_{x-Q}$, whence $N(a_Q + p - 1) = 1$ and $N(a_Q + p) = 0$. Therefore $b^{(m)}$ is a good bead of N, the node $B^{(m)}$ corresponds to this bead, and $P(\mathrm{N}_{b^{(m)}}) = m(\nu)_{B^{(m)}} = m(\nu_B)$.

All the initial spaces of $\mathrm{N}_{b^{(m)}}$ from runner H are: $b^{(m)}$; H if $Q > 0$; a_{Q+p-1} if $p - 1 \mid Q$. If in the last case $Q > 0$, then the space a_{Q+p-1} is not conormal. We put $c = H$ if $Q > 0$ and $c = H + p$ if $Q = 0$. We have $c \leqslant a_{Q+p-1} < b_{x-Q} \leqslant b^{(m)}$. Therefore all the conormal spaces of $\mathrm{N}_{b^{(m)}}$ from runner H are $b^{(m)}$ and c.

Case 1.1: $m(\mu) \neq P(\mathrm{N}^c_{b^{(m)}})$. Denote by C the addable node of $m(\nu_B)$ corresponding to the space c of $\mathrm{N}_{b^{(m)}}$. If we suppose $[S^{m(\nu)} : D^{m(\mu)}] = 0$, then by (7.4), Lemma 3.10 applied to the following parameters:

$$r := n - 1, \quad \lambda := m(\nu_B), \quad \alpha := \bar{H}, \quad k := 2, \quad B_1 := C, \quad B_2 := B^{(m)}, \quad \gamma := m(\mu)$$

yields a contradiction $m(\mu) = m(\nu_B)^C = P(\mathrm{N}^c_{b^{(m)}})$. Thus $[S^{m(\nu)} : D^{m(\mu)}] > 0$, $m(\nu) \trianglelefteq m(\mu)$ and $m(\nu) \trianglelefteq m(\mu)$.

Case 1.2: $m(\mu) = P(\mathrm{N}^c_{b^{(m)}})$. If one of the conditions $R = 2$ or $Q = 0$ is violated, then $\mathrm{N}^c_{b^{(m)}}$ contains the following normal beads not belonging to runner $H - R$: $b^{(m)} - 1$ if $R > 2$; the bead of $\langle H, S_1, Q\rangle$ from runner $H - 1$ if $R = 2$ and $Q > 0$. Therefore the partition $m(\mu) = P(\mathrm{N}^c_{b^{(m)}})$ contains normal nodes of residue different from $\bar{H} - \bar{R} = -\alpha$, which is a contradiction.

We have $x = 2$, $h(\nu) = H > 2$, $\nu = \widetilde{\lambda^{(H,2)}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{N} &= \overline{(-\infty, H - 2 + p) \cup \{H - 1 + p\} \cup (H + p, 2p) \cup \{H - 2 + 2p, H + 2p\}}, \\ \mathrm{N}^c_{b^{(m)}} &= \overline{(-\infty, H - 2 + p) \cup [H + p, 2p) \cup \{H - 2 + 2p, H - 1 + 2p\}}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

Hence $m(\mu) = (H^2, 2^{p-H}) = \lambda^{(p-H+2,2,2)}$. By Lemma 6.6, we get $\mu = \lambda^{(H-2,2)}$, which contradicts the hypothesis of the theorem.

Case 2: $R = 1$. Since $x > 1$, we have $Q > 0$. In the proof of Lemma 6.3, it was shown that $a_{Q+p-2} \leqslant b_{x-Q-1} < b_{x-Q}$. Denote by $b^{(m)}$ the element of $\langle H, S_1, Q\rangle$ from runner H. Since $Q > 0$, this bead is normal in N. Clearly, there is no other normal bead of N in runner H. Therefore $b^{(m)}$ is a good bead of N, the node $B^{(m)}$ corresponds to this bead, and $P(\mathrm{N}_{b^{(m)}}) = m(\nu)_{B^{(m)}} = m(\nu_B)$.

All the initial spaces of $\mathrm{N}_{b^{(m)}}$ from runner H are: $b^{(m)}$; H; $b_{x-Q+p-H+1}$ if $p - H + 1 \mid x - Q - 1$. In the last case the space $b_{x-Q+p-H+1}$ is not conormal in $\mathrm{N}_{b^{(m)}}$, since $b^{(m)} \leqslant a_{Q+p-2} < b_{x-Q}$. We put $c = H$. Since $Q > 0$, we have $c < b^{(m)}$. Therefore all the conormal spaces of $\mathrm{N}_{b^{(m)}}$ from runner H are $b^{(m)}$ and c. Denote by C the addable node of $m(\nu_B)$ corresponding to the space c of $\mathrm{N}_{b^{(m)}}$.

Case 2.1: $m(\mu) \neq P(\mathrm{N}^c_{b^{(m)}})$ is similar to case 1.1.

Case 2.2: $m(\mu) = P(\mathrm{N}^c_{b^{(m)}})$. We have $h(m(\mu)) = 2p - H + 1$ and $h(\mu) \leqslant H - 1$. Hence $e(\mathrm{N}^c_{b^{(m)}}) \leqslant h(\mu) + h(m(\mu)) \leqslant 2p$. Clearly, this can happen only if $b^{(m)} = a_{Q+p-2} = H + p$ (arguments similar to the ones used in the proof of Lemma 6.3). In this case

$$\mathrm{N}^c_{b^{(m)}} = \overline{(-\infty, H-1) \cup [H, H+p) \cup \langle p+H-1, S_2, x-Q\rangle} \tag{7.6}$$

and $m(\mu) = P(\mathrm{N}^c_{b^{(m)}})$ is a p-singular partition, which is a contradiction.

Thus we have considered all possible cases and proved that $m(\nu) \trianglelefteq m(\mu)$. We have $h(\mu) < h(\nu) < p$ and $h(m(\mu)) \leqslant h(m(\nu))$. By (6.2) and (6.3), we have

$$h(\mu) + h(m(\mu)) < h(\nu) + h(m(\nu)) = e(\nu) + [p \nmid e(\nu)] \leqslant 2p.$$

Therefore μ satisfies system (7.3) and Lemma 7.2 yields $\mu = \lambda^{(h',i,x)}$, where $0 < i \leqslant h'$, x and $h' < p$. Since the only normal bead of $\lambda^{(h',i,x)}$ has residue $-\bar{h}'$, the hypothesis of the current theorem yields $-\bar{h}' = \alpha = \bar{R} - \bar{H}$. Since $0 < H - R < p$, we have $-p < H - R - h' < p$. But $H - R - h'$ is divisible by p, whence $h' = H - R = h$.

From $m(\nu) \trianglelefteq m(\mu)$ and Theorem 6.8, it follows that part (2) of the condition $\pi(H, x, i)$ is satisfied. We claim that part (1) of the condition $\pi(H, x, i)$ is satisfied. It suffices to prove that $H, x > 2$.

Indeed, if $H = 2$ then $h = 1$, x is an odd number greater than 2 and $\nu = (\frac{x+1}{2}p, \frac{x-1}{2}p)$, $\mu = (px)$. By [KSh2, Lemma 3.5(iv)], we get $x = 2p-1$ and $(\nu, \mu) = ((p^2, p^2-p), (2p^2-p))$. This is a contradiction.

If $x = 2$ then part (2) of the condition $\pi(H, x, i)$ is not satisfied, contrary to what was proved. □

Lemma 7.8.

(a) $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{2p^2-p}}(D^{(p^2,p^2-p)}, D^{(2p^2-p)}) \cong K$;

(b) $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{2p}}(D^{\widetilde{\lambda^{(H,2)}}}, D^{\lambda^{(H-2,2)}}) \cong K$, *where* $2 < H < p$.

Proof. (a) follows from [KSh2, Lemma 3.5(iv)].

(b) It follows from (7.5) and Lemma 6.3 that $m\bigl(\widetilde{\lambda^{(H,2)}}\bigr) = \widetilde{\lambda^{(p-H+2,2)}}$. Hence by Theorem 4.6, we get

$$K \cong \mathrm{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{2p}}(D^{\lambda^{(p-H+2,2)}}, D^{m\left(\widetilde{\lambda^{(H,2)}}\right)}) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{2p}}(D^{\widetilde{\lambda^{(H,2)}}}, D^{m(\lambda^{(p-H+2,2)})}). \tag{7.7}$$

By Lemma 6.6, we have $m(\lambda^{(p-H+2,2)}) = m(\lambda^{(p-H+2,2,2)}) = \lambda^{(H-2,2)}$ (see case 1.2 of the proof of the previous lemma). Substituting this value into (7.7), we get the desired equivalence. □

8 Upper bound

8.1 General construction. To make the approach of § 4.1 applicable to almost completely splittable partitions, we shall modify it as follows.

Let X be a set satisfying the same conditions as in § 4.1 and we somehow know a map $\zeta : X \to \mathbb{Z}'$ such that

$$\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\nu, D^\mu) \leqslant \zeta(\nu,\mu) \text{ for any pair } (\nu,\mu) \in X \text{ of partitions of } n. \tag{8.1}$$

Define the map $U : X \to \mathbb{Z}'$ by induction as follows. We put $U(\emptyset,\emptyset) = 0$. Now let (ν,μ) be a pair of nonempty partitions of X. For any μ-good node A, let $m_A(\nu,\mu)$ equal:

- $\varepsilon(\nu,\mu_A)$ if there is no ν-good node of residue $\operatorname{res} A$;
- $U(\nu_B,\mu_A) + \varepsilon(\nu,\mu_A)$ if there is a ν-good node B of residue $\operatorname{res} A$ and $(\nu_B,\mu_A) \in X$;
- $+\infty$ if there is a ν–good node B of residue $\operatorname{res} A$ and $(\nu_B,\mu_A) \notin X$.

We put $U(\nu,\mu) = \min\bigl(\{\zeta(\nu,\mu)\} \cup \{m_A(\nu,\mu) : A \text{ is a } \mu\text{-good node}\}\bigr)$.

Lemma 8.1. *Let $(\nu,\mu) \in X$. Then $\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\nu, D^\mu) \leqslant U(\nu,\mu)$, where $\nu,\mu \vdash n$.*

Proof is by induction on n applying Lemma 3.2. □

8.2 Case of almost completely splittable partitions.

Let us keep the following notation until the end of this section:

$$X = \{(\nu,\mu) : \nu \text{ is almost completely splittable, } \mu \text{ is } p\text{-regular, } \nu \ntrianglerighteq \mu \;, \nu \sim \mu\}.$$

Define ζ as follows. Let $(\nu,\mu) \in X$ be a pair of partitions of n. We put $x = n/p$ and $H = h(\lambda)$, where λ is the preimage of ν. We define $\zeta(\nu,\mu) = +\infty$ except the following cases:

(1) $\mu \ntrianglerighteq \nu$. We put $\zeta(\nu,\mu) = 0$.

(2) $\mu \triangleright \nu$ and (ν,μ) is minimal.

  (2.1) $(\nu,\mu) = ((p^2, p^2 - p), (2p^2 - p))$. We put $\zeta(\nu,\mu) = 1$.

  (2.2) $(\nu,\mu) = (\widetilde{\lambda^{(H,2)}}, \lambda^{(H-2,2)})$, where $H > 2$. We put $\zeta(\nu,\mu) = 1$.

  (2.3) Cases (2.2) and (2.3) do not hold and there is no i such that $\nu = \widetilde{\lambda^{(H,x)}}$, $\mu = \lambda^{(H-\operatorname{rem}(x,H),i,x)}$ and $\pi(H,x,i)$ is satisfied. We put $\zeta(\nu,\mu) = 0$.

It follows from Proposition 2.2 and Lemmas 7.7, 7.8 that property (8.1) holds for ζ we have just defined.

Theorem 8.2. *Let ν,μ be p-regular partitions of n such that ν is almost completely splittable and $\nu \ntrianglerighteq \mu$. Then $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\nu, D^\mu) = 0$ except the case when $\mu = \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\lambda)$, where λ is the preimage of ν, $H = h(\lambda)$ and one of the following conditions holds:*

(1) $H = 2$ *and* $\varepsilon = (1,-1), (-p,p)$;

(2) $H = 3$ *and* $\varepsilon = (0,-1,1), (-1,1,0), (-1,-1,2)$;

(3) $H > 3$ *and* $\varepsilon = (0,-1,0^{H-3},1), (-1,0^{H-3},1,0), (-1,-1,0^{H-4},1,1)$;

(4) $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(H, x, i)$ *for* x *and* i *such that* $\pi(H, x, i)$ *is satisfied.*

In cases (1)-(3) the bound $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_n}(D^\nu, D^\mu) \leqslant 1$ *holds.*

Proof. In view of Proposition 2.3, it suffices to assume $\nu \sim \mu$. Therefore we must prove that $U(\nu, \mu) = 0$ for any pair $(\nu, \mu) \in X$ except cases (1)-(4) and that $U(\nu, \mu) \leqslant 1$ in cases (1)-(3). Apply induction on n. If $n = 0$ then by definition we have $U(\nu, \mu) = 0$.

Now let $n > 0$ and suppose that theorem is true for partitions of numbers less than n. Choose some abaci M and Λ of the same shift such that $\mu = P(\mathrm{M})$ and $\lambda = P(\Lambda)$.

Case 1: $\mu \not\trianglerighteq \nu$. Then $U(\nu, \mu) = \zeta(\nu, \mu) = 0$.

Case 2: $\mu \vartriangleright \nu$ and the pair (ν, μ) is not minimal. Let A be a μ-good node such that either there is no ν-good node of residue $\operatorname{res} A$ or such a node B exists and ν_B is almost completely splittable. Denote by a the bead of M corresponding to A.

First consider the case $\varepsilon(\nu, \mu_A) = 1$. Then $\tilde{\Lambda} = (\mathrm{M}_a)^c$ for some conormal space c of M_a. Since $\nu \sim \mu$ and $\nu \vartriangleleft \mu$, we get that a and c belong to the same runner and moreover a is below c. We have $\mathrm{M} = (\tilde{\Lambda}_c)^a$.

If $H = 2$ then we get $c = \mathrm{b}^\Lambda - p$, $a = \mathrm{b}^\Lambda + p$ and $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda = \mathrm{b}_\Lambda + 1$. Hence $\mathrm{M} = \{\mathrm{b}_\Lambda - p, \mathrm{b}^\Lambda + p\} = \mathcal{H}_{(1,-1)}(\Lambda)$.

If $H > 3$ then either $c = \mathrm{b}^\Lambda - p$, $a = \mathrm{b}^\Lambda$, $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda = \mathrm{b}^\Lambda(2) + 1$ or $c = \mathrm{b}_\Lambda(2)$, $a = \mathrm{b}^\Lambda(2) + p$, $\mathrm{b}_\Lambda(2) = \mathrm{b}_\Lambda + 1$. In the first case $\mathrm{M} = \mathcal{H}_{(0,-1,0^{H-3},1)}(\Lambda)$ and in the second case $\mathrm{M} = \mathcal{H}_{(-1,0^{H-3},1,0)}(\Lambda)$. Note that in all cases the only bead of $\tilde{\Lambda}$, belonging to the same runner as a is c, which is not normal. Therefore there is no ν-good node of residue $\operatorname{res} A$ and $U(\nu, \mu) \leqslant m_A(\nu, \mu) = \varepsilon(\nu, \mu_A) = 1$.

Now consider the case $\varepsilon(\nu, \mu_A) = 0$. If there is no ν-good node of residue $\operatorname{res} A$, then $U(\nu, \mu) = m_A(\nu, \mu) = 0$. Therefore we assume that there is a ν-good node B of residue $\operatorname{res} A$. By the choice of A, the partition ν_B is almost completely splittable. Applying Lemma 4.3(b), we get $\nu_B \not\trianglerighteq \mu_A$, whence $(\nu_B, \mu_A) \in X$. Hence $U(\nu, \mu) \leqslant m_A(\nu, \mu) = U(\nu_B, \mu_A)$. Therefore in the sequel we will consider the case $U(\nu_B, \mu_A) > 0$.

Let b be the bead of $\tilde{\Lambda}$ corresponding to B. If $\chi(\lambda) = p$ then b is different from the greatest bead of $\tilde{\Lambda}$ (i.e., $r(B) > 1$), since otherwise the greatest bead of $\tilde{\Lambda}_b$ equal to $b - 1$ is not movable up, which contradicts the fact that ν_B is almost completely splittable. Hence $\nu_B = \widetilde{\lambda_D}$, where D is a λ-good node (see the definition of $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon$ or [S2, Lemma 8]).

We put $\bar{H} = h(\lambda_D)$. By the inductive hypothesis, we get $\mu_A = \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\lambda_D)$, where ε is the sequence described in cases (1)-(4) of the current theorem, where H is replaced by $\bar{H}$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{H}} \varepsilon_i = 0$, we have $\mathrm{M}_a = \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\Lambda_d)$, where d is a bead of Λ corresponding to D.

Recall that a and d are cogood spaces of M_a and Λ_d respectively, since a and d are cogood beads of M and Λ respectively. Since $\varepsilon \neq (0^{\bar{H}})$, we have $\varepsilon_j < 0$ for some $1 \leqslant j \leqslant \bar{H}$. Hence $e \leqslant \mathrm{b}^{\Lambda_d}(j) - p$, where e is the smallest space of Λ_d. Therefore $d \neq e$, as otherwise we would get $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda = \mathrm{b}^{\Lambda_d}$, $\mathrm{b}_\Lambda = e$, $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda - \mathrm{b}_\Lambda \geqslant \mathrm{b}^{\Lambda_d}(j) - e \geqslant p$, which contradicts the fact that Λ is completely splittable. Hence $H = \bar{H}$.

We have $d = \mathrm{b}^{\Lambda_d}(k) + 1 < \mathrm{b}_{\Lambda_d} + p$, as $\mathrm{b}_{\Lambda_d} + p$ is not a conormal space of Λ_d. Obviously the only cogood space of M_a, which equals $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\Lambda_d)$ from the same runner as d is $\mathrm{b}^{\Lambda_d}(k) + p\varepsilon_k + 1$. Hence $a = \mathrm{b}^{\Lambda_d}(k) + p\varepsilon_k + 1$, $\mathrm{M} = \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\Lambda)$ and $U(\nu, \mu) \leqslant 1$ in cases (1)-(3).

Case 3: $\mu \vartriangleright \nu$ and (ν, μ) is minimal. The desired assertion follows from the definitions of U and ζ. □

The general form of the sequences $\varepsilon(H, x, i)$ is quite complicated. However we have the following assertion.

Lemma 8.3. *Let H be an integer such that $\frac{p+3}{2} \leqslant H < p$. Then $\pi(H, x, i)$ is satisfied if and only if $x = QH + 1$, $Q \in \mathbb{Z}$, $Q \geqslant 1$ and $i = H - 1$. In this case $\varepsilon(H, x, i) = (-Q - 1, \bar{q}^{H-1-r}, (\bar{q} + 1)^r)$, where $\bar{q} = \operatorname{quo}(Q + 1, H - 1)$ and $r = \operatorname{rem}(Q + 1, H - 1)$.*

Proof. Assume $\pi(H, x, i)$ is satisfied. We shall use the notation of Definition 7.4. We put

$$\delta = H - Q - 1 + h \left[\frac{x-Q-1}{p-H+1}\right] + (R - 1) \left[\frac{x-Q-2}{p-H+1}\right] - m \left[\frac{p-h+x-1}{p-m}\right].$$

Suppose $R > 2$. Since $m \leqslant h$, we have

$$\delta \geqslant h \left(\left[\frac{x-Q-1}{p-H+1}\right] - \left[\frac{x-1}{p-H+2}\right] \right) + \left(\left[\frac{x-Q-2}{p-H+1} + 1\right] - \left[\frac{x}{H}\right] \right) + R - 2.$$

To obtain a contradiction with condition (2) of Definition 7.4, it suffices to prove that both differences in the outer brackets are nonnegative. This follows from the inequalities

$$\frac{x-Q-1}{p-H+1} - \frac{x-1}{p-H+2} = \frac{x-1-Q(p-H+2)}{(p-H+1)(p-H+2)} = \frac{Q(2H-(p+2))+R-1}{(p-H+1)(p-H+2)} > 0,$$

$$\frac{x-Q-2}{p-H+1} + 1 - \frac{x}{H} = \frac{(2H-(p+2))x+H(p-1-H)+R}{H(p-H+1)} > 0.$$

Now suppose $R = 2$. Then $Q \geqslant 1$. We have

$$\delta \geqslant h \left(\left[\frac{x-Q-1}{p-H+1}\right] - \left[\frac{x-1}{p-H+2}\right] \right) + \left(\left[\frac{x-Q-2}{p-H+1}\right] - \left[\frac{x}{H}\right] \right) + R - 1.$$

Nonnegativity of the difference in the first pair of the brackets is shown just as above. We have

$$\frac{x-Q-2}{p-H+1} - \frac{x}{H} = \frac{(2H-(p+3))x+H(Q-2)+4}{H(p-H+1)}.$$

The last expression and thus the difference in the second pair of the brackets is nonnegative if $Q \geqslant 2$. If $Q = 1$ then $x = H + 2$ and we have

$$\left[\frac{x-Q-2}{p-H+1}\right] - \left[\frac{x}{H}\right] = \left[\frac{H-1}{p-H+1}\right] - \left[\frac{H+2}{H}\right] = \left[\frac{H-1}{p-H+1}\right] - 1 \geqslant 0.$$

We have a contradiction with condition (2) of Definition 7.4.

Thus we have proved that $R = 1$. Hence $x = QH + 1$, $Q \geqslant 1$ and $m = i$. Suppose $i \neq H - 1$. Then $i \leqslant H - 2$. We have

$$\delta \geqslant H-Q-1+h \left[\frac{x-Q-1}{p-H+1}\right] - (H-2) \left[\frac{p-H+x}{p-H+2}\right] = h \left(\left[\frac{x-Q-1}{p-H+1}\right] - \left[\frac{x-2}{p-H+2}\right] \right) + \left(\left[\frac{x-2}{p-H+2}\right] - \left[\frac{x}{H}\right] \right) + 1.$$

The difference in the first pair of the outer brackets of the right hand side is nonnegative, as

$$\frac{x-Q-1}{p-H+1} - \frac{x-2}{p-H+2} = \frac{x-2-(Q-1)(p-H+2)}{(p-H+1)(p-H+2)} = \frac{(Q-1)(2H-(p+2))+H-1}{(p-H+1)(p-H+2)} > 0.$$

We have

$$\frac{x-2}{p-H+2} - \frac{x}{H} = \frac{(2H-(p+2))x-2H}{H(p-H+2)} = \frac{(2H-(p+3))x+H(Q-2)+1}{H(p-H+2)}.$$

The last expression and thus the difference in the second pair of the brackets is nonnegative if $Q \geqslant 2$. If $Q = 1$ then $x = H + 1$ and we have

$$\left[\frac{x-2}{p-H+2}\right] - \left[\frac{x}{H}\right] = \left[\frac{H-1}{p-H+2}\right] - \left[\frac{H+1}{H}\right] = \left[\frac{H-1}{p-H+2}\right] - 1 \geqslant 0.$$

We have a contradiction with condition (2) of Definition 7.4.

Finally for $x = QH + 1$ and $i = H - 1$, where Q is any positive integer, we have

$$\delta = h \left(\left[\frac{x-1-Q}{p-H+1}\right] - \left[\frac{x-1}{p-H+1}\right] \right) - Q < 0,$$

whence it follows that $\pi(H, x, i)$ is satisfied. Now it is clear that $\varepsilon(H, x, i)$ is given exactly by the suggested formula.

□

9 Applications to branching rules

9.1 Preliminary facts. In the following proposition, which follows directly from [BK2, Theorems E, E′], $\mathrm{Res}_\alpha 0$ is understood as 0.

Proposition 9.1. *Let λ be a p-regular partition and $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.*

- *If there is no λ-normal (λ-conormal) node of residue α, then $\mathrm{Res}_\alpha D^\lambda = 0$ ($\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda = 0$).*
- *If there is exactly one λ-normal (λ-conormal) node A of residue α, then $\mathrm{Res}_\alpha D^\lambda \cong D^{\lambda_A}$ ($\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda \cong D^{\lambda^A}$).*

Lemma 9.2. *Let M be a module such that $\mathrm{head}\, M \cong \mathrm{soc}\, M$ and $N_1, \ldots, N_k$ be mutually nonisomorphic simple modules such that $[M : N_i] = 1$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Then either $M \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^k N_i$ or there is a simple module N nonisomorphic to any of $N_1, \ldots, N_k$ such that $\mathrm{Hom}(M, N) \neq 0$.*

Proof. Suppose there is no such a module N. Prove by induction on $n = 0, \ldots, k$ that there exists a subset $S_n \subset \{1, \ldots, k\}$ of cardinality n such that $\bigoplus_{i \in S_n} N_i$ is isomorphic to a submodule of M. The set $S_0 = \emptyset$ corresponds to the case $n = 0$. Now let $0 < n < k$ and $\iota : \bigoplus_{i \in S_n} N_i \to M$ be an embedding of modules. Since $|S_n| < k$, we have $\mathrm{Im}\, \iota \neq M$ and there is a maximal submodule M_0 of M containing $\mathrm{Im}\, \iota$. By our assumption, $M/M_0 \cong N_j$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \setminus S_n$. Since $\mathrm{head}\, M \cong \mathrm{soc}\, M$, we can put $S_{n+1} = S_n \cup \{j\}$.

We have $S_k = \{1, \ldots, k\}$. By our assumption from the beginning of the proof, we get $M \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^k N_i$. □

Lemma 9.3. *Let λ be a partition of height less than p and B be a λ-addable node such that λ^B is p-singular. Then $\lambda = (1^{p-1})$ and $B = (p, 1)$.*

Proof. Since $h(\lambda^B) \leqslant p$ and λ^B is p-singular, we have $\lambda^B = (k^p)$. Hence $k = (\lambda^B)_p = 1$ and $B = (p, 1)$. □

9.2 Inducing completely splittable modules. In what follows, the image of an R-module M in the Grothendieck group of R is denoted by $[M]$.

Theorem 9.4. *Let λ be a completely splittable partition of n and $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Suppose there are more than one λ-conormal nodes of residue α. Then there are exactly two such nodes. Denote them by A and B, where A is above B. Then (in the Grothendieck group of $K\Sigma_{n+1}$)*

$$[\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda] = \begin{cases} 2[D^{\lambda^A}] + [D^{\lambda^B}] & \textit{if } h_{1,1}(\lambda) \neq p-1 \textit{ or } p > 2, \lambda = (p-1); \\ 2[D^{\lambda^A}] + [D^{\lambda^B}] + [D^{\widetilde{\lambda^A}}] & \textit{if } h_{1,1}(\lambda) = p-1 \textit{ and } \lambda \neq (1^{p-1}), (p-1); \\ 2[D^{(2,1^{p-2})}] + [D^{(3,1^{p-3})}] & \textit{if } p > 2 \textit{ and } \lambda = (1^{p-1}); \\ 2[D^{(2)}] & \textit{if } p = 2 \textit{ and } \lambda = (1). \end{cases}$$

Proof. There are exactly two such nodes, since all proper beads of any abacus of λ belong to different runners. We put $\nu = \lambda^A$. Clearly, ν is completely splittable, A is a ν-good node and $h(\lambda) = h(\nu)$. Suppose the assertion of the current theorem does not hold.

First consider the case where $h_{1,1}(\lambda) \neq p-1$ or $p>2$, $\lambda=(p-1)$. Then λ^B is p-regular by Lemma 9.3 and $[\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda : D^{\lambda^B}]=1$. Applying Lemma 9.2 to the following parameters

$$M := \mathrm{rad}\,\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda / \mathrm{soc}\,\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda, \qquad k:=1, \qquad N_1 := D^{\lambda^B},$$

and taking into account $[\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda : D^{\lambda^A}]=2$, we get that there is a module D^γ isomorphic neither to D^{λ^B} nor D^{λ^A} such that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\mathrm{rad}\,\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda, D^\gamma) \neq 0$.

By Lemma 3.10, we have $0 < [\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda : D^\gamma] \leqslant 2[S^{\lambda^A} : D^\gamma]$ and thus $\nu=\lambda^A \lhd \gamma$. Hence $\lambda \neq (p-1)$ (and therefore $h_{1,1}(\lambda)\neq p-1$), $h(\nu)>1$ and $p>2$. Since $\mathrm{head}\,\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda \cong D^\nu$, we have $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(D^\nu, D^\gamma)\neq 0$. Theorem 4.6 implies $\gamma=\tilde{\nu}$. We have $h(\lambda)=h(\nu)>1$ and $p \leqslant h_{1,1}(\nu) \leqslant h_{1,1}(\lambda)+1$ by Lemma 4.5. Taking into account $h_{1,1}(\lambda)\neq p-1$, we get $h_{1,1}(\lambda)\geqslant p$ and thus λ is a big partition. Therefore $\tilde{\nu}=\tilde{\lambda}^C$, where C is a $\tilde{\nu}$-good node of residue α. Since $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(S^\nu, D^{\tilde{\nu}})=0$ by Proposition 2.1, we have by Lemma 3.7 that

$$1 \leqslant \dim \mathrm{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\mathrm{rad}\,\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda, D^\gamma) = \dim \mathrm{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\mathrm{rad}\,\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^{\nu_A}, D^{\tilde{\nu}}) \leqslant \varepsilon(\nu, \tilde{\nu}_C) = \varepsilon(\lambda^A, \tilde{\lambda}).$$

Hence $\lambda^A = \tilde{\lambda}^D$. This is possible only if $r(A)=1$ and $\chi(\lambda)=p$. This contradicts the fact that A is a λ-conormal node.

Now consider the case where $h_{1,1}(\lambda)=p-1$ and $\lambda \neq (1^{p-1}), (p-1)$. We have $p>2$, $n \geqslant 2$ and $A=(1,\lambda_1)$. We put $A^t=(\lambda_1,1)$. We have $(\lambda^t)^{A^t}=(\lambda^A)^t$. Since λ is a p-core, by [Mu, Lemma 5.2], we get $m(\lambda)=\lambda^t$. By [S2, Lemma 11], we get $m((\lambda^A)^t)=\widetilde{\lambda^A}$. By [BK2, Theorem E(iv)] and Proposition 7.3, we get

$$1 = [D^{\lambda^t}{\uparrow}^{\Sigma_{n+1}} : D^{(\lambda^t)^{A^t}}] = [D^{\lambda^t}{\uparrow}^{\Sigma_{n+1}} \otimes \mathrm{sgn}_{n+1} : D^{(\lambda^A)^t} \otimes \mathrm{sgn}_{n+1}] =$$

$$[D^{m(\lambda^t)}{\uparrow}^{\Sigma_{n+1}} : D^{m((\lambda^A)^t)}] = [D^{\lambda}{\uparrow}^{\Sigma_{n+1}} : D^{\widetilde{\lambda^A}}] = [\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda : D^{\widetilde{\lambda^A}}].$$

In the case under consideration λ^B is p-regular and $[\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda : D^{\lambda^B}]=1$. Applying Lemma 9.2 to the following parameters

$$M := \mathrm{rad}\,\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda / \mathrm{soc}\,\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda, \qquad k:=2, \qquad N_1 := D^{\lambda^B}, \qquad N_2 := D^{\widetilde{\lambda^A}}$$

and taking into account $[\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda : D^{\lambda^A}]=2$, we get that there is a module D^γ isomorphic to none of D^{λ^B}, $D^{\widetilde{\lambda^A}}$, D^{λ^A}, such that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\mathrm{rad}\,\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda, D^\gamma)\neq 0$. Since $\mathrm{head}\,\mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^\lambda \cong D^{\lambda^A}$, we have $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(D^{\lambda^A}, D^\gamma)\neq 0$. Similarly to the previous case Lemma 3.10 implies $\lambda^A \lhd \gamma$. Hence by Theorem 4.6, we get a contradiction $\gamma=\widetilde{\lambda^A}$.

If $p>2$ then multiplying $[\mathrm{Ind}^{\overline{-1}} D^{(p-1)}] \cong 2[D^{(p)}]+[D^{(p-1,1)}]$ by sgn_p and applying Proposition 7.3, we get $[\mathrm{Ind}^{\bar{1}} D^{(1^{p-1})}] \cong 2[D^{(2,1^{p-2})}]+[D^{(3,1^{p-3})}]$.

Finally the formula $[\mathrm{Ind}^{\bar{1}} D^{(1)}]=2[D^{(2)}]$ for $p=2$ can be checked by dimension comparison. □

Theorem 9.5. *Let λ be a completely splittable partition of n different from (1^{p-1}) and $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Denote by B the bottom λ-addable node (i.e. from the first column). Suppose there are more than one λ^B-normal nodes of residue α. Then except B there is only one such node A. We have $\mathrm{Res}_\alpha D^{\lambda^B} \cong \mathrm{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}$.*

Proof. Let $B_1, \ldots, B_k$ be all λ-conormal nodes different from B. Since there are more than one λ^B-normal nodes of residue α, the residues $\mathrm{res}\,B$, $\mathrm{res}\,B_1, \ldots, \mathrm{res}\,B_k$ are mutually distinct. Hence $D^\lambda\uparrow_{\Sigma_{n+1}} \cong D^{\lambda^B}\oplus D^{\lambda^{B_1}}\oplus\cdots\oplus D^{\lambda^{B_k}}$. Now it is clear that the only nonsimple indecomposable summand of $D^\lambda\uparrow_{\Sigma_{n+1}}\downarrow_{\Sigma_n}$ is $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^{\lambda^B}$.

Let A_1, …, A_l be all the λ-normal nodes. The residues $\operatorname{res} A_1$, …, $\operatorname{res} A_l$ are mutually distinct and $D^\lambda\downarrow_{\Sigma_{n-1}} \cong D^{\lambda_{A_1}}\oplus\cdots\oplus D^{\lambda_{A_l}}$. The only nonsimple indecomposable summand of $D^\lambda\downarrow_{\Sigma_{n-1}}\uparrow_{\Sigma_n}$ is $\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}$.

By the subgroup theorem [CR, (44.2)] applied to $G := \Sigma_{n+1}$, $R = S := \Sigma_n$ and $L := D^\lambda$, we have $D^\lambda\uparrow_{\Sigma_{n+1}}\downarrow_{\Sigma_n} \cong D^\lambda\downarrow_{\Sigma_{n-1}}\uparrow_{\Sigma_n} \oplus D^\lambda$. By the Krull-Schmidt theorem, we have $\operatorname{Res}_\alpha D^{\lambda^B} \cong \operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\lambda_A}$. □

9.3 Inducing some almost completely splittable modules.

Theorem 9.6. *Let λ be a big partition of n having height $H \geqslant \frac{p+3}{2}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ such that $h_{2,1}(\lambda) \neq p-1$ and the condition $\overline{\lambda_1} = -\overline{h(\lambda)} = \alpha$ does not hold. Suppose there are more than one $\tilde\lambda$-conormal nodes of residue α. Then there are exactly two such nodes. Denote them by A and B, where A is above B. We have $[\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\tilde\lambda}] = 2[D^{\tilde\lambda^A}] + [D^{\tilde\lambda^B}]$ (in the Grothendieck group of $K\Sigma_{n+1}$).*

Proof. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 9.4, we obtain that there exactly two such nodes. Let Λ be an abacus of λ and c be its minimal space. Denote by a and b the spaces of $\tilde\Lambda$ corresponding to A and B respectively. The case $h(\tilde\lambda) < h(\lambda)$ is impossible, as we would have $c = \mathrm{b}^\Lambda - p$, which contradicts the existence of more than one initial space of $\tilde\Lambda$ in the same runner. Therefore $h(\tilde\lambda) = h(\lambda)$ and $c = b$. Hence $\tilde\lambda$ is not completely splittable and in particular $\tilde\lambda \neq (1^{p-1})$. By Lemma 9.3, $\tilde\lambda^B$ is p-regular.

Since $\operatorname{res} A = \operatorname{res} B$ and the condition $\overline{\lambda_1} = -\overline{h(\lambda)} = \alpha$ is violated, there exists $i = 2$, …, H such that the runner containing $\mathrm{b}^\Lambda(i)+1$ contains the space c and no proper bead of Λ. Hence $\tilde\lambda^A = \widetilde{\lambda^D}$, where D is a λ-cogood node such that $h(\lambda^D) = H$. Therefore λ^D is big.

Suppose that the assertion of the current theorem does not hold. We put $\nu = \tilde\lambda^A$ and denote by d the space of Λ corresponding to D. Applying Lemma 9.2 to the parameters

$$M := \operatorname{rad}\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\tilde\lambda}/\operatorname{soc}\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\tilde\lambda}, \qquad k := 1, \qquad N_1 := D^{\tilde\lambda^B}$$

and taking into account $[\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\tilde\lambda} : D^{\tilde\lambda^A}] = 2$, we get that there is a module D^γ isomorphic neither to $D^{\tilde\lambda^B}$ nor $D^{\tilde\lambda^A}$ such that $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\operatorname{rad}\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\tilde\lambda}, D^\gamma) \neq 0$. By Lemma 3.10, we get $0 < [\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\tilde\lambda} : D^\gamma] \leqslant 2[S^{\tilde\lambda^A} : D^\gamma]$ and thus $\nu = \tilde\lambda^A \lhd \gamma$. Since $\operatorname{head}\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\tilde\lambda} \cong D^\nu$, we have $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(D^\nu, D^\gamma) \neq 0$. Theorem 8.2 and Lemma 8.3 imply $\gamma = \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\lambda^D)$ for ε equal to one of the following sequences: $(0,-1,0^{H-3},1)$; $(-1,0^{H-3},1,0)$; $(-1,-1,0^{H-4},1,1)$; $(-Q-1,\bar q^{H-1-r},(\bar q+1)^r)$, where $Q \geqslant 1$, $\bar q = \operatorname{quo}(Q+1,H-1)$ and $r = \operatorname{rem}(Q+1,H-1)$.

If we suppose that $h(\gamma) < H$, then, taking into account the exact form of possible values of ε mentioned above, we get $c = \mathrm{b}^{\Lambda^d} - p$ or $c = \mathrm{b}^{\Lambda^d}(2) - p$. However the former condition does not hold as $i > 1$ and the latter does not hold as $h_{2,1}(\lambda) \neq p-1$. Hence $h(\gamma) = H$, there exists a unique γ-normal node E of residue α and $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(\lambda) = \gamma_E$.

Since $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(S^\nu, D^\gamma) = 0$ by Proposition 2.1, we have by Lemma 3.7 that

$$1 \leqslant \dim\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\operatorname{rad}\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\tilde\lambda}, D^\gamma) = \dim\operatorname{Hom}_{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\operatorname{rad}\operatorname{Ind}^\alpha D^{\nu_A}, D^\gamma) \leqslant \varepsilon(\tilde\lambda^A, \gamma_E).$$

Hence $\tilde\lambda^A = (\gamma_E)^F$, where $\operatorname{res} F = \alpha$. Clearly, either $F = E$ or $h((\gamma_E)^F) > H$. The former case is impossible as $\tilde\lambda^A \lhd \gamma$ and the latter is impossible as $h(\tilde\lambda^A) = H$. □

Remark. The reader can by oneself formulate and prove the analog of Theorem 9.5 for almost completely splittable partitions.

9.4 Conjectures. The following conjectures are based on Theorem 8.2 and calculations within the known decomposition matrices.

Conjecture 9.7. *Let λ be a big partition of n having height H and $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ such that $\overline{\lambda_1} = -\overline{h(\lambda)} = \alpha$ does not hold. Suppose there are more than one $\tilde{\lambda}$-conormal nodes of residue α. Then there are exactly two such nodes. Denote them by A and B, where A is above B. We have*

$$[\operatorname{Ind}^{\alpha} D^{\tilde{\lambda}}] =$$

$$\begin{cases} 2[D^{\tilde{\lambda}^A}] + [D^{\tilde{\lambda}^B}] & \textit{if } h_{2,1}(\lambda){\neq}p-1; \\ 2[D^{\tilde{\lambda}^A}] + [D^{\tilde{\lambda}^B}] + [D^{\mathcal{H}_{(-2,2)}(\tilde{\lambda}^A)}] & \textit{if } h_{2,1}(\lambda){=}p-1 \textit{ and } H{=}2; \\ 2[D^{\tilde{\lambda}^A}] + [D^{\tilde{\lambda}^B}] + [D^{\mathcal{H}_{(0,-1,1)}(\tilde{\lambda}^A)}] + [D^{\mathcal{H}_{(1,-1,0)}(\tilde{\lambda}^A)}] & \textit{if } h_{2,1}(\lambda){=}p-1 \textit{ and } H{=}3; \\ 2[D^{\tilde{\lambda}^A}] + [D^{\tilde{\lambda}^B}] + [D^{\mathcal{H}_{(0,-1,0^{H-3},1)}(\tilde{\lambda}^A)}] + [D^{\mathcal{H}_{(0,-1,0^{H-4},1,0)}(\tilde{\lambda}^A)}] & \textit{if } h_{2,1}(\lambda){=}p-1 \textit{ and } H{>}3. \end{cases}$$

Example. Let $p = 7$ and $\lambda = (5,4,2,2)$. Then $\tilde{\lambda} = (6,4,2,1)$ and $[\operatorname{Ind}^3 D^{(6,4,2,1)}] = 2[D^{(6,5,2,1)}] + [D^{(6,4,2,1,1)}] + [D^{(6,6,2)}] + [D^{(7,7)}]$. We have $\lambda_1 = 5 \neq -4 = -h(\lambda) \pmod 7$, $h_{2,1}(\lambda) = 6$, $A = (2,5)$, $B = (5,1)$, $\tilde{\lambda}^A = (6,5,2,1)$, $\tilde{\lambda}^B = (6,4,2,1,1)$, $\mathcal{H}_{(0,-1,0,1)}(\tilde{\lambda}^A) = (6,6,2)$, $\mathcal{H}_{(0,-1,1,0)}(\tilde{\lambda}^A) = (7,7)$.

Conjecture 9.8. *Let λ be a completely splittable partition of height H such that $\chi(\lambda) = p$ and let $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Denote by A the top λ-addable node (i.e. from the first row). Suppose there are more than one λ^A-normal nodes of residue α. Then except A the only such node is the bottom λ-removable node B. We have*

$$[\operatorname{Res}_{\alpha} D^{\lambda^A}] = \begin{cases} 2[D^{\tilde{\lambda}}] + [D^{\lambda}] + [D^{\mathcal{H}_{(-1,0^{H-3},1,0)}(\lambda)}] + x[D^{\mathcal{H}_{(0,-1,0^{H-3},1)}(\lambda)}] & \textit{if } H > 2; \\ 2[D^{\tilde{\lambda}}] + [D^{\lambda}] + x[D^{\mathcal{H}_{(1,-1)}(\lambda)}] & \textit{if } H = 2, \end{cases}$$

where $x = [h_{2,1}(\lambda) \geqslant p]$.

Example. Let $p = 5$ and $\lambda = (5,5,3)$. Then $A = (1,6)$, $\lambda^A = (6,5,3)$ and $[\operatorname{Res}_0 D^{(6,5,3)}] = 2[D^{(6,5,2)}] + [D^{(5,5,3)}] + [D^{(9,2,2)}] + [D^{(6,6,1)}]$. We have $\tilde{\lambda} = (6,5,2)$, $\mathcal{H}_{(-1,1,0)}(\lambda) = (9,2,2)$, $\mathcal{H}_{(0,-1,1)}(\lambda) = (6,6,1)$ and $h_{2,1}(\lambda) = 6$.

Conjecture 9.9. *If λ is a completely splittable partition of height 3 such that $h_{1,1}(\lambda) = 2p-1$, then $[\operatorname{Ind}^{-\bar{3}} D^{\tilde{\lambda}}] = 2[D^{\tilde{\lambda}^A}] + [D^{\tilde{\lambda}^B}] + [D^{\mathcal{H}_{(0,1,-1)}(\tilde{\lambda}^A)}]$, where $A = (3, \tilde{\lambda}_3 + 1)$ and $B = (4,1)$.*

Example. Let $p = 5$ and $\lambda = (7,6,6)$. Then $\tilde{\lambda} = (9,6,4)$ and $[\operatorname{Ind}^2 D^{(9,6,4)}] = 2[D(9,6,5)] + [D(9,6,4,1)] + [D(10,10)]$. We have $h_{1,1}(\lambda) = 9$, $\tilde{\lambda}^A = (9,6,5)$, $\tilde{\lambda}^B = (9,6,4,1)$ and $\mathcal{H}_{(0,1,-1)}(\tilde{\lambda}^A) = (10,10)$. Moreover with the help of the known decomposition matrices and the subgroup theorem [CR, (44.2)], it is easy to verify Conjecture 9.9 for $p = 5$.

References

[BK1] J. Brundan and A. S. Kleshchev, Modular Littlewood-Richardson coefficients, *Math. Z.*, **232** (1999), 287–320.

[BK2] J. Brundan and A. S. Kleshchev, On translation functors for general linear and symmetric groups, *Proc. London Math. Soc.(3)*, **80** (2000), n. 1, 75–106.

[BeO] C. Bessenrodt and J. B. Olsson, On Mullineux symbols, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, **68** (1994), n. 2, 340–360.

[CR] C. Curtis and I. Reiner, Representation theory of finite groups and associative algebras, *Interscience Publ.*, New York, London, 1962.

[D] S. Donkin, On Schur algebras and related algebras. I, *J. Algebra*, **104** (1986), n. 2, 310–328.

[FK] B. Ford and A. S. Kleshchev, A proof of the Mullineux conjecture, *Math. Z.*, **226** (1997), n. 2, 267–308.

[G] J. A. Green, Polynomial representations of $GL_n(K)$, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, v. 830, *Springer-Verlag*, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1980.

[H] D. J. Hemmer, The Ext^1-quiver for completely splittable representations of the symmetric group, *J. Group Theory* (2001), n. 4, 401–416.

[J] J. C. Jantzen, Representations of algebraic groups, Pure and Applied Mathematics, 131, *Academic Press, Inc.*, Boston, MA, 1987.

[Ja] G. D. James, The representation theory of the symmetric groups, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics 682*, Springer, Berlin, 1978.

[JaKe] G. D. James and A. Kerber, The representation theory of the symmetric group, *Addison-Wesley*, London, 1981.

[JaM] G. D. James and G. E. Murphy, The determinant of the Gram matrix for a Specht module, *J. Algebra*, **59** (1979), n. 1, 222–235.

[K1] A. S. Kleshchev, Branching rules for modular representations of symmetric groups. I, *J. Algebra*, **178** (1995), n. 2, 493–511.

[K2] A. S. Kleshchev, Branching rules for modular representations of symmetric groups. III: Some corollaries and a problem of Mullineux, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **54** (1996), n. 2, 25–38.

[K3] A. S. Kleshchev, Completely splittable representations of symmetric groups, *J. Algebra*, **181** (1996), n. 2, 584–592.

[K4] A. S. Kleshchev, On decomposition numbers and branching coefficients for symmetric and special linear groups, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, **75** (1997), n. 3, 497–558.

[KN] A. S. Kleshchev and D. Nakano, On comparing the cohomology of general linear and symmetric groups, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, **201** (2001), 339–355.

[KSh1] A. S. Kleshchev and J. Sheth, On extensions of simple modules over symmetric and algebraic groups, *J.Algebra*, **221** (1999), n. 2, 705–722.

[KSh2] A. S. Kleshchev and J. Sheth, Corrigendum: “On extensions of simple modules over symmetric and algebraic groups, *J.Algebra*, **238** (2001), n. 2, 843–844.

[Mu] G. Mullineux, Bijections of p-regular partitions and p-modular irreducibles of the symmetric groups, *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, **20** (1979), n. 1, 60–66.

[S1] V. V. Shchigolev, On the stabilization problem for submodules of Specht modules, *J. Algebra*, **251** (2002), n. 2, 790–812.

[S2] V. V. Shchigolev, On some extensions of completely splittable modules, *Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat.*, **68** (2004), n. 4, 131–150.